CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 85/09)

Canada

0-315-19421-9

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

73

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

67329

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

DR. PAMELA EDWINAH OBONDI WANGA

Date of Birth — Date de naissance 15TH SEPT. 1948	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance KENYA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

P.O. BOX 12576, NAIROBI, KENYA

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

AN ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK AND THE SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

University — Université

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

PH.D

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade 1983	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse DR. GORDON MCINTOSH

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

JUNE 3, 1983 Date	Signature PWanga.

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK AND THE SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

by

© PAMELA EDWINAH OBONDI WANGA

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1983

micro

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Pamela Edwinah Obondi Wanga

TITLE OF THESIS An Analysis of Supervisory Feedback and the Satisfaction of Student Teachers

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1983

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

P Wanga

PERMANENT ADDRESS

P.O. Box 12576
Nairobi, Kenya

DATED June 3, 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled AN ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK AND THE SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS submitted by Pamela Edwinah Obondi Wanga in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

R. G. McIntosh
. . . .
Supervisor

E. Miklos
. . . .

Eugene W. Ratsoy
. . . .

. . . .

J. W. Maclean
. . . .
External Examiner

Date . . . May 16, 1983 . . . .

LOVINGLY DEDICATED TO MY MOTHER

PHILLIDAH OKUL OBONDI

WHO "FATHERED" ME

(Died Tuesday, 8th March, 1983)

To my mother who "fathered" me
May your success today see
As we fatherless children rummaged
With your love and prayers encouraged.

You "widowed" us through with candor
Filling the rough paths with humor
To complete the good work father begun
With nothing less than lots of fun.

Into thy hands I dedicate with honor
One of your many fruits of splendor
Please accept this gift of love
And with it many thanks have.

May I give you an assurance of our pride
Of a mother whose memories will not glide
Out of our minds whose learning you've "furthered"
Into the depths of the things we've gathered.

Mom, you've left us sad and parentless
And yet, you know, in our hearts we are resentless
And so may the peace you enjoy there
Comfort us all who mourn for you here.

Thanks, Mom,

Rest In Peace Now!

Pam, Lucas, Carol and Jimmy

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the characteristics of supervisory feedback and to examine the relationships of such feedback to three selected variables.

First, the study examined the extent to which the supervisory processes approached optimal effectiveness according to fifteen propositions regarding effective feedback derived from the literature review as perceived by the student teachers; second, topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions were explored in terms of seven subproblems. Third, the study investigated satisfaction of student teachers with various supervisory practices and two other sets of relationships: rated effectiveness of supervisory practices and satisfaction of student teachers; and topic areas and overall supervisory effectiveness.

The study population consisted of 25 student teachers enrolled in the fourth year Plan B practicum program at the University of Alberta, 25 cooperating teachers in five elementary schools in the city of Edmonton and 4 faculty consultants from different departments in the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta. The special characteristics of the Plan B probram are outlined in Chapter 3 of the study and in Appendix D.

Five research questions and various related subproblems were developed to guide the data collection and analyses. Data were collected using three research instruments adopted for purposes of this study -- the Feedback Analysis Form, the Post-Observation Conference Checklist and the Satisfaction Questionnaire. The scaled-responses were analyzed using various statistical techniques whereas the open-ended items were content analyzed. A total of 202 (73.5%) usable returns of the expected 275 was considered to be satisfactory for purposes of this study.

The major findings were as follows: 1) both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were found to be effective supervisors although cooperating teachers generally tended to be more highly rated than faculty consultants; 2) classroom management and presentation of lesson tended to contribute most significantly to topics of discussion; 3) supervisory supportiveness offered the most satisfaction to student teachers; 4) supportiveness of school principals and, to a lesser extent, other staff members also contributed significantly not only to the satisfaction of student teachers but more so to the overall effectiveness of the supervisors; 5) situational factors accounting for the more favourable perception of cooperating teachers' supervisory effectiveness on the part of student teachers included the greater time they spent with student teachers on a more regular daily basis and their actual detailed knowledge of the specific situation in which the student teachers were working; 6) the supervisory conference was found to be important in an effective student teaching program in relation to the other factors such as quality of supervisor and the leadership role of the principal in enhancing the student teaching experience in the school.

The least helpful supervisory feedback was perceived by student teachers to be poorly timed; inadequate; irregularly provided; not based on observational data; not constructive, specific and concrete; and not checked for understanding at the end of the session. Inadequate matching of supervisor-student teacher personalities and lack of precision in evaluation procedures; insufficient practice of self-evaluation and time pressures for instructional planning were other factors that caused concern to the student teachers.

Based on the findings above, recommendations were made for the administration and training of supervisors and for further research. More specifically, it was recommended that both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers be trained for supervisory roles if effective student teaching experiences are anticipated by teacher education institutions including the University of Alberta. Such training would warrant certification of some sort to only those who would meet the requirements for supervisory roles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the guidance and encouragement of my thesis advisor, Dr. R. G. McIntosh and, indeed, my other Advisory Committee members, Dr. M. Horowitz, Dr. E. Miklos, and Dr. E. Ratsoy, all of whom allowed me to benefit from their vast experiences. My thanks, to Dr. J. Thorlacius, my external examiner, for his very special contribution to the final stage of this study.

My very special gratitude to the supervisors and student teachers. Without them, this study would not have been possible.

May I commend Mrs. C. Prokop for her cheerful guidance of the data analysis, Mrs. G. Zinner for her conscientious typographical assistance, Dr. J. Seger for his special contributions to this study, the Huttons for the warmth of their friendship and Mrs. Shirley Kabachia for making it all possible in her own way.

A very special "Ashante" to my long-suffering husband, Lucas, my forgiving children, Caroline (5) and Jimmy (1½) and to other family members whose encouragements echo through the success of my studies - especially my late mother Mrs. Phillidah Obondi.

Finally, may I give thanks to our Heavenly Father from whom all blessings flow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

DEDICATION.................................... iv

ABSTRACT...................................... v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..............................viii

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE..... 1

   INTRODUCTION 1

   BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM.................. 2

   Research on Supervision of Student Teachers... 4

   Research on the Post-Observation Conference... 4

   CONTEXT OF THE STUDY....................... 6

   PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.................................... 7

   RESEARCH QUESTIONS......................... 7

   Research Question 1: Effectiveness of Supervisory Feedback.......................... 8

   Sub-Problem 1:1........................... 8

   Sub-Problem 1:2........................... 8

   Sub-Problem 1:3........................... 8

   Research Question 2: Topic Areas (Substance) of Supervisory Feedback.................. 8

   Sub-Problem 2:1........................... 8

   Sub-Problem 2:2........................... 8

Sub-Problem 2:3 8
Sub-Problem 2:4 8
Sub-Problem 2:5 8
Sub-Problem 2:6 8
Sub-Problem 2:7 9
Research Question 3: Satisfaction of Student Teachers with Supervisory Feedback 9
Sub-Problem 3:1 9
Sub-Problem 3:2 9
Research Question 4: Relating Effectiveness to Satisfaction 9
Research Question 5: Relating Topic Areas to Overall Supervisory Effectiveness 9
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS 9
DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 13
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 14
ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS 15
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 18
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK 20
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO THE SUBSTANCE (TOPIC AREAS) OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK 35
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO TYPOLOGIES OF SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES 45
Overview of Supervision 45
Typologies of Supervisory Conferences 53
Supervisor-Directed Conference 53
Non-Directed Conference 55
Interactive Conference 57

The Instructional Conferences.............. 65

Type A Conference........................ 65

Type B Conference........................ 66

Type C Conference........................ 66

Type D Conference........................ 67

Type E Conference........................ 68

The Evaluative Conferences................. 68

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO MODES OF FEEDBACK OR SPECIFIC SUPERVISORY TECHNIQUES.................................. 69

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF RELATED LITERATURE TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEMS.......... 76

3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY................................ 79

THE SAMPLE..................................... 79

The Student Teachers........................ 79

The Cooperating Teachers.................... 81

The Faculty Consultants..................... 81

Initial Contact with the Sample.............. 82

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY................ 84

Research Instrument Related to Effectiveness of Supervisory Processes.................... 84

Construction of the Feedback Analysis Form.................................. 85

Modification of the Feedback Analysis Form.................................. 85

The Training Session with the Student Teachers........................ 86

Research Instrument Related to Topic Areas (Substance) of Supervisory Feedback... 90

Construction of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist..................... 90

Validation and Revision of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist.......... 90

Research Instrument Related to Student Teachers' Satisfaction with Supervisory Feedback.................................. 92

Construction of the Satisfaction Questionnaire.......................... 93

Reliability of the Satisfaction Questionnaire.......................... 94

Validity of the Satisfaction Questionnaire.......................... 95

Content Validity.......................... 95

Construct Validity...................... 97

TIME LINE FOR DATA COLLECTION.................. 97

TREATMENT OF THE DATA.......................... 98

Responses of Student Teachers to Items on the Feedback Analysis Form.............. 98

Responses Pertaining to the Substance of Supervisory Feedback as Recorded by the Researcher on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist..................... 100

Responses of Student Teachers to Items on the Satisfaction Questionnaire............. 100

Comparison of Mean Scores.................... 101

T-tests (F-tests).......................... 101

Frequency and Percentage Distributions 103

Factor Analysis and Satisfaction Scores....... 103

Content Analysis............................ 104

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients............................. 105

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis........ 105

4. THE DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE.................. 110

THE INTENDED RETURNS (IN)..................... 110

The IN for the Feedback Analysis Form......... 112

The IN for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist.................................... 114

The IN for the Satisfaction Questionnaire..... 114

The Intended Total N (IN)..................... 115

THE ACTUAL RETURNS (AN)........................ 119

The AN for the Feedback Analysis Form......... 119

The AN for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist........................ 123

The AN for the Satisfaction Questionnaire..... 125

Summary of the Intended and the Actual Returns.................................... 125

Summary of Factors that Contributed to Non-Response.......................... 128

5. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICES.......................... 132

RESEARCH QUESTION 1........................... 132

Supervisory Effectiveness Between Schools..... 135

Change in Effectiveness Scores................ 137

Effectiveness of Consultants and Cooperating Teachers........................ 138

Discussion.................................... 141

6. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: TOPIC AREAS DISCUSSED IN SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK SESSIONS................ 144

RESEARCH QUESTION 2........................... 144

Topic Areas Discussed 145

Personal Qualities........................ 145

Instructional Planning.................... 146

Content of Lesson......................... 146

Presentation of Lesson.................... 147

Quality of Interpersonal Relationships 147

Classroom Management........................ 148

Discipline.................................. 148

Review of Performance....................... 149

Informal Conversation....................... 150

Others...................................... 150

Frequency of Occurrence of the Topics and Time Spent on Each Topic for the Total Sample.................................. 151

Discussion.................................. 154

Comparison of Occurrence of Topics for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers.................................... 156

Discussion.................................. 156

Comparison of Time Spent on Each Topic by Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers.................................... 159

Discussion.................................. 162

Pattern of Initiation of Topics............. 162

Comparison of Topic Initiation Between Faculty Consultants and Student Teachers... 162

Comparison of Topic Initiation Between Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers.. 165

Discussion.................................. 167

Topics with which Feedback Sessions Started Out................................. 169

Discussion.................................. 169

The Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics..... 171

Discussion.................................. 177

Topics with which Supervisory Sessions Ended....................................... 178

Discussion.................................. 180

7. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS WITH SUPERVISORY PRACTICES IN FEEDBACK SESSIONS.................. 181

RESEARCH QUESTION 3............................ 181

The Factor Analysis........................... 182

Satisfaction with Supervisory Supportiveness............................ 188

Discussion................................ 188

Satisfaction with Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback...................... 191

Discussion................................ 191

Satisfaction with Quality of Interaction...... 193

Discussion................................ 193

Between School Differences in Satisfaction Scores.................................... 193

Helpfulness of Feedback Sessions.............. 195

Suitability of Locations...................... 197

Other Preferred Locations..................... 199

Content Analysis of Open-Ended Items.......... 201

8. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: RELATING EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK TO SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS............................ 203

RESEARCH QUESTION 4............................ 203

9. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: RELATING OVERALL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE TO PATTERNS OF DISCUSSION OF THE TOPICS......................... 208

RESEARCH QUESTION 5............................ 208

Determining Overall Supervisory Scores........ 209

Grouping the Supervisors...................... 209

Frequency of Occurrence of Topics............. 212

Discussion................................ 212

Frequency of Occurrence of the Topics per Session........................... 214

Discussion.............................. 214

Time Spent on Topics........................ 216

Discussion.............................. 218

Pattern of Initiation of Topics.............. 218

Discussion.............................. 221

Topics with which Feedback Sessions Started Out........................... 221

Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics.......... 224

Discussion.............................. 224

Topics with which Supervisory Sessions Ended.................................. 229

Discussion.............................. 229

10. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS......................... 232

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGY......... 232

Statement of the Problem................... 233

Instrumentation and Methodology.............. 233

The Sample................................ 234

Treatment of the Data....................... 234

Major Findings............................. 235

Research Question 1....................... 235

Research Question 2....................... 236

Research Question 3....................... 239

Research Question 4....................... 241

Research Question 5....................... 242

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS........................... 244

Conclusions.................................... 244

Implications for Administration and Training of Supervisors.................... 250

Implications for Further Research............ 256

BIBLIOGRAPHY.. 261

APPENDICES.. 273

A. THE FEEDBACK ANALYSIS FORM........................ 274

Hyman's Original Feedback Analysis Form (blank).. 275

Hyman's Original Feedback Analysis Form (completed).................................... 276

Modified Feedback Analysis Form used for the Study.. 277

B. THE POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE CHECKLIST......... 278

C. THE SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE.................... 279

Main's Attitude Survey.......................... 280

Joyce's "On Call" Reports by College Supervisors - Form A.......................... 283

Joyce's Monthly Questionnaire for Supervisory Adequacy - Form C_2............................ 284

The Satisfaction Questionnaire................... 285

D. PLAN B PRACTICUM PROGRAM......................... 292

An Article on the Plan B Program 293

The Schedule for the 1980-81 Plan B Practicum....................................... 299

E. INITIAL REQUEST FORMS AND LETTERS OF APPROVAL... 300

Cooperative Activities Program (Initial Request Form).................................. 301

Letter of Approval from Edmonton Catholic School District.................................. 303

Letter of Approval from Edmonton Public School Board 304

Request for Research Summary 305

F. OUTLINE OF INITIAL CONTACTS AND RESEARCH DIARY 306

G. PACKAGE FOR THE TRAINING SESSION 312

An Analysis of the 15 Items on the Feedback Analysis Form 313

Time Schedule for the Researchers' Visits to the Schools 321

H. RESULTS OF t-TESTS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS SCORES OF FACULTY CONSULTANTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS 322

Results of t-Tests on the Effectiveness Scores for Each Item, All Schools Combined 323

Results of t-Tests on Overall Effectiveness Scores by School 325

I. PICTORIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF THE SEQUENCE OF OCCURRENCE OF THE TOPICS AS INITIAL AND SECOND TOPICS 326

The Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics in Faculty Consultants' Sessions 327

The Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics in Cooperating Teachers' Sessions 328

J. RESULTS OF F-TESTS ON SATISFACTION SCORES 329

1. Results of F-Tests on Supportiveness Scores 330

2. Results of F-Tests on Adequacy of Feedback Scores 331

3. Results of F-Tests on Quality of Interaction Scores 332

K. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF OPEN-ENDED ITEMS 333

L. DETERMINATION OF OVERALL SUPERVISORY SCORES BY SCHOOL.................................. 340

School 1... 341

School 2... 342

School 3... 343

School 4... 344

School 5... 345

Total Effectiveness, Satisfaction and Overall Supervisory Scores for Individual Schools.............................. 346

Total Effectiveness and Supervisory Scores for Individual Supervisors............... 347

Comparison of Overall Supervisory Scores Between Schools................................ 348

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Teaching Effectiveness Components: A Comparison.......... 42

2. Time Line for the Study.......... 99

3. Strategy for Question 1.......... 106

4. Strategy for Question 2.......... 107

5. Strategy for Question 3.......... 108

6. Strategy for Questions 4 and 5.......... 109

7. The Number of Student Teachers (n) and Cooperating Teachers in in each School.......... 111

8. Number of Faculty Consultants in Each School.......... 113

9. Intended Returns for the Feedback Analysis Form.......... 114

10. Intended Returns for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist.......... 116

11. Intended Returns for the Satisfaction Questionnaire.......... 117

12. The Intended Total N (IN).......... 118

13. A Comparison of the Intended and the Actual Returns for the Feedback Analysis Form.......... 120

14. A Comparison of the Intended and the Actual Returns for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist.......... 124

15. A Comparison of the Intended and the Actual Returns of the Post-Observation Conference Checklists by Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers.......... 126

16. A Summary of the Intended and Actual Returns of the Satisfaction Questionnaire.................................. 127

17. A Summary of the Intended and the Actual Returns for the Three Instruments.................................. 129

18. Rank Order of Mean Scores and Results of t-tests on the Process Scores, Item by Item for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers, All Schools and Weeks Combined.......................... 134

19. Comparison of Supervisory Effectiveness Scores of Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers.......................... 136

20. Results of F-tests on Overall Mean Effectiveness Scores for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers, Week by Week, all Schools Combined............................... 139

21. Items on Which There Were Significant Differences in Supervisory Effectiveness Between Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers in Two Schools.................................. 140

22. Occurrence and Time Spent on Each Topic for all the Supervisors................ 152

23. Comparison of Occurrence of the Topics in the Faculty Consultants' and the Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions................................. 157

24. Comparison of Time Spent on Each Topic in the Faculty Consultants' and Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions................................. 160

25. Frequency and Percent of Initiation of the Topics for the Total Sample........... 163

26. Comparison of Initiation of Topics Between Faculty Consultants and Student Teachers.......................... 165

27. Comparison of Percent of Initiation of Topics Between Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers................. 166

28. Frequency and Percent of the Topics with Which Supervisory Feedback Sessions Started Out........................ 170

29. Percent of Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics for the Total Sample.................................... 172

30. Percent of Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the Faculty Consultants' Feedback Sessions............... 173

31. Percent of Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions.......................... 175

32. Frequency and Percent of the Topics with which Supervisory Feedback Sessions Ended.............................. 179

33. Factor Analysis: Satisfaction Items........... 183

34. Items Included in Factor One: Supervisory Supportiveness..................... 185

35. Items Included in Factor Two: Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback.................................. 186

36. Items included in Factor Three: Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions........................... 187

37. Comparison of Supervisory Supportiveness Scores Between Schools.............. 189

38. Comparison of Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback Scores Between Schools.............. 192

39. Comparison of Quality of Interaction Scores Between Schools......................... 194

40. Comparison of Helpfulness of Supervisory Feedback in Enhancing Selected Teaching Practices.......................... 196

41. Comparison of the Use of Various Locations for Holding Supervisory Feedback Sessions.......................... 198

42. Comparison of Suitability of the Locations Used for Holding Supervisory Feedback Sessions................. 200

43. A Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Relating Faculty Consultants' Supervisory Effectiveness and Student Teachers' Satisfaction........................ 205

44. A Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Relating Cooperating Teachers' Supervisory Effectiveness and Student Teachers' Satisfaction........................ 206

45. Comparison of the Correlations Between the Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers..................... 207

46. Rank Order of Overall Supervisory Scores.................................... 211

47. Comparison of Occurrence of the Topics in the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions............... 213

48. Average Number of Topics that Occurred per Session......................... 215

49. Comparison of Percent of Time Spent on Each Topic in the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions.................................. 217

50. Comparison of Initiation of Topics by Supervisors and Student Teachers Between the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisors............... 220

51. Comparison of Total Initiation of Topics by the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisors............... 222

52. Comparison of the Topics with which the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions Started Out.................................. 223

53. Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the More Effective Supervisory Sessions.................................. 225

54. Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions.................................... 226

55. Comparison of the Topics with Which the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions Ended...................................... 230

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

INTRODUCTION

The perceived importance of field experiences (student teaching) in the preparation of teachers is indicated by the widespread practice of including such components in pre-service teacher education curricula. Various writers have suggested that student teaching is the most effective and useful experience included in the education of prospective teachers. Among others who have commented on teacher education, Conant (1963) and Hermanowicz (1966) have stressed the necessity of student teaching ~~in~~ order to provide "real-life" experience in regular classroom situations. The National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional Standards (1966:1) has observed that "student teaching is almost universally accepted as the most dynamic phase of teacher education." The Ontario Department of Education's Committee on the Costs of Education Report (1972:21 - 22) discusses the value of student teaching and states:

> In this setting (the classroom) he (the student teacher) is able to see the application of theory to practice, to observe the realities of the every-day situation and to practice skills under the supervision of a superior teacher.

The statement "under the supervision of a superior teacher" implies that the cooperating teacher, in whose classroom the student practices, must have expertise in supervision and in the competencies required to be rated as a superior classroom teacher. Conant (1963:61) also advises that the teacher of student teachers must be ". . . a highly competent teacher of both classroom pupils and student teachers." This is supported by Combs (1974) who maintains the need for "teaching supervisors who are more than master teachers." These statements imply that the faculty consultants (university supervisors) must also have expertise in teaching and the required supervisory competencies.

The overall goal of supervision of student teachers is to effect behavioral change in the student teacher's classroom performance (Mitzel, 1964). The specific aspect of supervision in which the supervisors directly influence the student teachers is in the conference situation, that is, a planned follow-up interaction between the supervisor and the student teacher for the purpose of discussing the student teacher's classroom performance.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Providing field experiences for student teachers during the student teaching period is an accepted practice in teacher education institutions, and indeed, there has been a trend for these institutions to increase the time allocated to such experiences (Peck and Tucker, 1973;

Barnett, 1975). There is, however, a growing concern about student teaching among teacher educators some of which are cited below. The concern has been with the limited research on two vital aspects of student teaching: supervision and the supervisory conference.

Zeichner (1978) has observed that the criticism of present practice is focused on "the argument that student teaching . . . serves merely to socialize prospective teachers into existing patterns," and that the field experience does not match the program rhetoric espoused by such groups as the Association of Teacher Educators (A.T.E.). According to A.T.E. (1973), the field experience is, among other things, "a time for experimentation and lively innovative teaching." Iannaccone (1963), and Hoy and Rees (1977) have also found latent effects of student teaching such as an increase in negative attitudes and in custodial ideology, and a rejection of theory.

Comprehensive reviews of the empirical literature on student teaching have been conducted by Peck and Tucker (1973) and Fuller and Brown (1975). A general conclusion which may be drawn from such reviews is that discussion and description of the field experience are substantial but basic studies of the processes involved are lacking. Davies and Amershek (1969:1384) have observed that "Studies of what really happens to the student teacher are vital."

Research on Supervision of Student Teachers

Reviews of supervision studies indicate that they are given a relatively low priority. A review of the publications of the Review of Educational Research from 1971 to 1977 have shown no inclusion of supervision studies. Leeper (1970) from a survey of the Association for Curriculum Development publications from 1943 to 1971 has reported that works on curriculum, instruction, and media are disproportionately represented in comparison with articles on supervision and professionalism. Comfort (1974) has found that only two percent of the materials in Educational Leadership, Phi Delta Kappan, NASSP Bulletin, and Today's Education published during the period of 1971 to 1973 concerned supervision.

Mosher and Purpel (1972:49) have also observed that "the methods which such (supervision) studies typically employ -- checklists, mailed questionnaires, recall -- are a further serious limitation. . . . "

Research on the Post-Observation Conference

The importance of the supervisor in influencing student teacher behavior has been stressed and further reported by Zeichner (1978) who has observed that the most clear and consistent finding from practice teaching research is that the cooperating (associate) teacher has a high degree of influence on the attitudes and behaviors of student teachers and that the faculty consultant seems to have little or no effect. Accordingly, it seems appropriate to study the supervisory practices in post-observation feedback sessions and their influences on student teachers. Focusing on the post-observation conference, i.e., the conference which occurs after the student's teaching has been observed by the supervisor, has been emphasized by Denham (1977:33) who notes that "very little is known about the post-observation analysis segment of student teacher instruction" and states:

> . . . it is past time for instructional supervision to have a data base, which would make possible the development of theory in supervision, which in turn would allow knowledge of teaching and learning to multiply much more rapidly.

Bennie (1964) reports that first year teachers have perceived the conference situation as the most useful supervisory technique. From his study of the ideal role of the supervisor, Bradley (1966) has also reported that the conference has been perceived as the most important component of the process of supervision. A study by Milanovich (1966) supports the significance of the supervisory conference during the student teaching period. Results of a study by Henry and Beasley (1972) have suggested that the conference situation ". . . is actually where the associate (cooperating teacher) teaches the student teacher." The perception of former student teachers of the value of the conference is reported in a study by Brehaut (1975). Brehaut has reported that first- and second-year teachers tended to report that "face-to-face" feedback and counselling which they received during their teacher training contributed substantially to the development of their teaching skills. Brehaut's results confirm those reported above stressing the importance of the conference in effecting behavioral change in the student teachers' classroom performance.

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

The importance of the student teaching segment of teacher education has been expressed by several writers cited above. The growing concern of most educators, however, has been with the limited knowledge about the post-observation conference aspect of student teaching supervision (Denham, 1977). This concern, therefore, suggests that an investigation of this area is timely and could contribute to the knowledge of supervisory practices in post-observation conferences during the student teaching period.

Such a study would contribute to our understanding of the characteristics of the feedback given by faculty consultants and cooperating teachers during the post-observation conference sessions. Specifically, this study focuses on three elements of supervisory feedback: effectiveness of supervisory feedback processes as perceived by the student teachers; the substance (topic areas) of supervisory feedback as recorded by the researcher; and, the student teachers' satisfaction with the supervisory practices during post-observation conference sessions.

Although the findings may be of relatively limited generalizability, given that the sample was drawn from a small group of student teachers (n = 25), it is still possible to draw relevant recommendations regarding the supervisory practices employed in post-observation feedback sessions and to identify areas for future research.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to collect descriptive information on the characteristics of feedback given by supervisors during the student teaching period with regards to:

a) propositions for effective feedback derived from the literature review;
b) the topic areas (substance) of supervisory feedback; and
c) satisfaction of student teachers with the feedback.

Analyses of the data served as the basis for recommendations regarding supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers in the University of Alberta's practicum program.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following _five_ research questions and related sub-problems were developed to guide the study:

1. Effectiveness of Supervisory Feedback

To what extent did the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers approach optimal effectiveness according to the 15 propositions of effective feedback derived from the literature review as perceived by the student teachers?

1:1. To what extent were there differences in effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers between schools?

1:2. To what extent were there differences in the effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers over the four weeks of student teaching?

1:3. To what extent were there differences between the effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers within schools?

2. Topic Areas (substance) of Supervisory Feedback

What were the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions during the student teaching period in relation to the following sub-problems:

2:1. How often did the topics occur?

2:2. How many topics occurred per session?

2:3. How much time was spent on each topic?

2:4. What was the pattern of initiation of the topics?

2:5. With what topics did the sessions start out?

2:6. What was the general sequence of occurrence of topics?

2:7. With what topics did the sessions end?

3. Satisfaction of Student Teachers with Supervisory Feedback Practices

To what extent did the student teachers express satisfaction with supervisory practices in feedback sessions during the student teaching period?

3:1. To what extent were there differences in the satisfaction of student teachers between schools?

3:2. To what extent were there differences in the satisfaction of student teachers within schools?

4. Relating Effectiveness to Satisfaction

Was there any discernible relationship between rated effectiveness of supervisory practices (research question 1) and satisfaction of student teachers (research question 3)?

5. Relating Topic Areas to Overall Supervisory Effectiveness

Were there any discernible differences in the topic areas of supervisory feedback between the more effective and the less effective supervisors (as determined by averaging total scores for variables investigated by research questions 1 and 3) with regards to the seven sub-problems listed under research question 2?

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Feedback

Feedback is defined in the dictionary (Webster, 1961:304) as "a partial reversion of the effects of a given process to its source." Mosher and Purpel (1972:55) state that:

> "Feedback" describes the comparison of sample data derived from the results of a process with a specific initial plan or goal of the process, for the purpose of controlling the process itself. The sample is returned, or "fed back," to its source and the error thus revealed determines the kind and amount of change required. In research on supervision, feedback is usually information about an individual's teaching which is offered to him after the fact. This information may be used to determine the degree to which teaching objectives were achieved; alternatively, it may be used as a basis for analyzing incidents or patterns in the interaction between teacher and students.

For the purposes of this study, feedback refers to a student teacher receiving information about his or her previous lesson from a university supervisor (faculty consultant) and/or a cooperating teacher during the post-observation conference session. Feedback session and post-observation conference session are used synonymously for purposes of this study.

Characteristics of Feedback

For purposes of this study characteristics of feedback refer to items that describe or are typical of either the process or substance of supervisory feedback during the student teaching period.

Process of Feedback

The term 'process' is used to refer to student teachers' perception of the effectiveness of supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers with particular reference to the 15 dimensions of "effective" feedback derived from the review of literature and summarized on the Feedback Analysis Form.

Substance of Feedback

The "substance" of feedback is used for purposes of this study to refer to the topic areas of supervisory feedback as recorded by the researcher on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist.

Satisfaction

The term "satisfaction" is used for purposes of this study to refer to the student teachers' perception of the degree of usefulness or helpfulness of various supervisory practices indicated by the items on the Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Student Teaching

The period of *guided* teaching when the student teachers take increasing responsibility for the teaching-learning process with a given group of pupils over a period of time. The student teaching period during which data collection was done for this study lasted *four* weeks. The term "student teaching" also includes those non-teaching functions usually performed by the teacher in conjunction with the actual classroom teaching. Other terms which are sometimes used synonymously with student teaching are:

practicum; field experiences; teaching practice; practice teaching; directed teaching; responsible teaching; and internship.

Student Teacher

A university student who is working under the guidance of supervising teachers, normally cooperating teachers and faculty consultants. For purposes of this study, the student teachers were the 25 students enrolled in the Plan B program at the University of Alberta. The Plan B program is discussed more fully in Chapter 3 (Design of the Study) and in Appendix D.

Cooperating Teacher

The cooperating teacher is the regular classroom teacher to whom the student teacher is assigned in an off-campus cooperating school. Other terms used synonymously are "supervising teacher," "master teacher" and "associate teacher". For purposes of this study the cooperating teacher was the one assigned to any one of the 25 student teachers making up the sample for the study. There were 25 cooperating teachers, one for each of the 25 student teachers.

Cooperating School

This term refers to any of the five schools where the 25 student teachers selected for the study were placed for the period of student teaching.

Faculty Consultant

A member of the supervisory team assigned to supervise and evaluate a particular group of student teachers in specific cooperating schools. The four faculty consultants included in the study were faculty members in various departments of the University of Alberta.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was confined to the 25 student teachers in the Plan B practicum program at the University of Alberta in academic year 1979-1980. The student teachers were in their fourth and last year of a Bachelor of Education degree program which was preparing them to teach in elementary schools. Only the five cooperating schools where the 25 student teachers were placed for the period of student teaching were included in the study. Of the five schools, four were in the Edmonton Public School System and one was in the Edmonton Separate School System. Only the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers assigned to supervise the 25 student teachers were included in the study.

Another delimitation was that the study was focused on the post-observation conference segment of student teaching supervision only since it is in the conference sessions that the student teachers are provided with the most feedback, and therefore, interact the most with their supervisors.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Since the study is concerned only with the feedback provided by supervisors of the Plan B student teaching program, its findings and conclusions are of limited generalizability. Other groups of student teachers in other programs would, perhaps, perceive supervisory feedback differently from the student teachers in the Plan [illegible] program.

Although it would have been desirable to use larger groups of student teachers, this was not feasible given time and financial constraints.

Another limitation was that it was necessary for the researcher to conduct the research alone. Although it was done as carefully as could be, the danger of personal bias influencing the discussions may have been present.

An important limitation of the study lies in the use of a questionnaire and two other non-standardized instruments to gather data for addressing the research questions. Problems inherent in these methods of data collection concern the reliability and validity of the instruments (discussed in Chapter 3), and the assumption that responses faithfully reflect the real perceptions and feelings of respondents.

Such grounds as may exist for generalizing any conclusions beyond the sample, given these limitations, are discussed in Chapter 3.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

The thesis is organized into ten chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 introduces the central problem of the study and its significance for supervisory practices during post-observation conference sessions between student teachers, faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. The purpose of the study and the statement of the problem are specified in terms of five major research questions and associated sub-problems. The background to the problem is provided by several reviews of related research findings which, in turn, are related to the context of the study. Several significant terms are defined for purposes of the study. Important delimitations and limitations which must be imposed because of the study sample are identified and the generalizability of the findings of the study are discussed.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature within the framework of the three research themes, that is, the effectiveness of supervisory practices in feedback sessions, the substance (topic areas) of post-observation conference sessions, and the satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory practices in feedback sessions during student teaching. Consequently, the chapter is organized into three sections as outlined above.

The design of the study is presented in Chapter 3.

Instrumentation and methodology of the research are discussed in terms of sampling, construction and adaptation of the research instruments, reliability and validity of the research instruments, revision of the instruments and the treatment of the data. The timeline for the study and a summary of the strategy for the study are provided at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 4 is concerned with the data gathering process. A comparison of the intended returns (IN) and the actual returns (AN) is made for the three research instruments and for the total sample.

The report of the research findings is contained in Chapters 5 through 9 in relation to the five research questions as follows: In Chapter 5, the research findings on effectiveness of supervisory practices are presented Chapter 6 contains the analysis of data related to the topic areas (substance) of supervisory feedback sessions; a report of the findings on satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory practices in feedback sessions is included in Chapter 7; research findings on the relationship between effectiveness of supervisory practices and satisfaction of student teachers are reported in Chapter 8 while data analyses establishing the relationship between effectiveness of supervisory practices and the topic areas (substance) of supervisory feedback are outlined in Chapter 9.

Chapter 10 contains a summary of the study and its findings, conclusions drawn by the researcher, and implications for future practice and investigation.

The final pages of the thesis are dedicated to bibliographic data and related appendices.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The process of supervision in the schools has as its stated aim the improvement of instruction. Essentially, the supervisor is a change agent who, through his interaction with the teacher, brings forces into play to facilitate the teacher's effort at self-improvement. One vehicle through which such change is attempted is the supervisory conference. When supervisor and teacher confront each other, the former communicates various observations and generally makes his assistance available. But the manner in which the supervisor conducts himself and the information he attempts to transmit are elements crucial to the outcome of the conference.

Certainly, the current state of the art vis-a-vis supervision raises at least as many questions as it answers. For example, Blumberg (1974) has reported that inservice teachers perceived the process either as a non-event or as negative, hence his provocative title: "Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War." In the case of preservice teachers, the picture is equally problematic.

Some studies on the impact of student teaching generally demonstrate that the process produces negative outcomes (Osman, 1959; Iannaccone, 1963; Matthews, 1967; Hoy, 1967; Gerwinner, 1968; Sorenson and Halpert, 1968) to the extent that student teachers in general become more authoritarian, rigid and less flexible, less responsive to pupils, impersonal, restrictive, arbitrary, bureaucratic, and custodial by the end of their student teaching experience. As a result, Mosher and Purpel (1972) have given the title "Supervision: The Reluctant Profession" to their book indicating that the process of supervision may in fact be iatrogenic, that is, designed to promote growth yet producing the opposite.

These negative contentions may have some implications for the interaction between the supervisor and the student teacher, especially during the post-observation conferences. First, they may serve to underline the importance of acceptable principles of effective supervision in providing feedback to the student teachers during post-observation conferences. Second, there may be various styles of supervisory conferences which may have various outcomes in varying situations. Third, particular topic areas of supervisory feedback may need to be emphasized and, fourth, specific supervisory techniques or modes of feedback may not be as effective as they should be in facilitating desired change in the student teachers' classroom teaching performance.

In this chapter, the review of the literature is focussed and organized around these four areas as follows: first, the principles underlying effective supervisory feedback are presented; second, topic areas of supervisory feedback are generated from a review of the various components and classifications of effective teaching presented in this section; third, various styles or typologies of supervisory conferences are explored; and, fourth, specific supervisory techniques or modes of feedback are outlined. A summary and implications of related literature to the research problems is included at the end of this chapter.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK

In this section, the review of literature is focussed on the 15 principles of effective supervisory feedback included in the 15 items on the Feedback Analysis Form (Appendix A). Each sub-section 1 through 15 represents each of the 15 principles.

1. Effective supervisory feedback should be supportive. The literature emphasizes the helping approach in supervision which is manifest in behavior that is supportive of the person who is the recipient of the feedback.

Blumberg (1974:92-94) categorizes this helping approach as a "support-inducing communications behavior" when he states:

> This category includes all the statements on the part of the supervisor with the exception of praise, the effect of which is to help build a healthy climate between him (the supervisor) and the teacher. Behaviour that releases tension is in this category as is that which conveys acceptance of feelings. Encouragement is categorized here.
>
> Verbal behaviour which may be inferred as

> supportive would be instances of encouragement such as affirming a student's statements with utterances "uh-huh," "mmhum," or "continue." Another indicator would be relieving tension with a joke or inoffensive light remark. Evidence of building the student's confidence would be "sure you can do it." An indication of a collegial relationship, which may be associated with supportiveness and is emphasized in the andragogical approach, would be the use of first names.

Hyman (1975:145) in suggesting how to give helpful feedback observes that "since feedback will probably mean to the teacher that he will need to change his actions, the teacher is likely to feel threatened." Therefore, it is the supervisor's responsibility to carefully organize and conduct the feedback session such that a positive, trustworthy atmosphere is created to remove much of the threat the teacher feels. Tuckman (1976:342) has also indicated that "it (feedback) is threatening. Hence some kind of support should accompany negative feedback."

2. Effective supervisory feedback should emphasize actual patterns of teaching performance. The Education Practicum Handbook (1979-80:50), prepared by the Division of Field Services, Faculty of Education, The University of Alberta, states:

> . . . the guiding concepts of clinical supervision are to help the student teacher capitalize on his strengths, compensate for his weaknesses, and develop his own individual and "best" teaching style. It is crucial, then, to reinforce effective teaching (performance).

Cogan (1961:14) supports this when he says:

> (The) purposes (of Clinical Supervision) are to improve teaching performance, not to reform

> personality; the proper subject of supervisory sessions is (teaching) behaviour, not persons; and the major goal is constructive, not merely critical.

Moreover, Cogan (1961:8) states the position more clearly in regard to Clinical Supervision:

> (The Supervisor) must be concerned with behaviour, not deep-lying patterns of personality . . . (he) must forge a cutting edge of supervision that will cut to the truth of the actual teaching performance and the results of the teaching (pupil achievement), without cutting into the self (teacher).

In other words, "feedback must be in terms that the teacher can understand and relate to" (Tuckman, 1976:341) and must provide clear, incontrovertible evidence of exactly how one appears to behave. Feedback should emphasize actual performance.

3. Effective supervisory feedback should focus on observation of actual classroom teaching. Feedback should be based on observations (Hyman, 1975:150) of a lesson that the student teacher has taught. This provides an accurate record that can be analyzed by the supervisor and the student teacher during the conference. Fuller and Manning (1973:509) emphasize the importance of "(the) feedback (that is) unambiguous, trustworthy, informative, and is accepted overtly and covertly by the teacher as representing what actually went on." The supervisor should "focus on what he heard or saw rather than what he assumed went on or what he inferred was the meaning or explanation behind the performance" (Hyman, 1975:146). Hyman (1975:146-147) gives further explanation of this characteristic of feedback when

he says:

> If you (supervisor) do make some interpretations based on your observations, then clearly identify them and ask the teacher to offer his own interpretations and comments. Preferably the observations you (supervisor) cite should be your own, rather than what someone else observed and passed on to you for transmission to the teacher. This focus will keep you (supervisor) on what you have observed rather than on motives, and thus the teacher will not be as defensive or threatened. For example, speak about "the fact that in each visit to the classroom you observed all the children engaged in the same activity as a whole group" rather than "why the teacher is afraid to try small group teaching."

4. Effective supervisory feedback should analyze teaching performance in a descriptive rather than evaluative way. The function of the post-observation conference is analysis of performance to promote change, and not evaluation. Evaluation must be kept separate (Education Practicum Handbook, 1979-80:49). Amidon, Kies, and Palisi (1966:56-57) have adapted interaction analysis to the training and supervision of teachers in in-service. The most important factor affecting the climate of the group in their study was the way in which feedback was provided to the participants. Several "ground rules" relative to effective feedback were established and used by the faculty group involved in the in-service project. One of the rules was related to analysis rather than evaluation of student teachers' performance during the post-observation conference and it stated:

> The person giving the feedback describes rather than evaluates the pattern of teaching. He attempts to give as objective a description as possible of what

> he heard happening, and he avoids saying that it was good or bad.

Hyman (1975:147) advises that the supervisor should "focus feedback on description rather than evaluation" and gives this explanation:

> Since the purpose of feedback is to alert the teacher to what effect his performance is having, it is necessary to be descriptive rather than judgemental. In giving feedback your task is to report on what is going on rather than on how well things are going on. Description within a particular framework is non-evaluative. For example, speak about "the fact that the teacher asks simple questions on empirical data without reasons to support them" rather than "it is poor teaching to ask data gathering questions."

5. Effective supervisory feedback should focus on specific and concrete teacher behaviors. Tuckman (1976:341) states that "feedback must involve concrete behaviors . . . ." Hyman analyzes this characteristic of feedback when he explains that:

> Feedback which is specific and concrete is helpful because the teacher can handle it himself. He can place the information in a time and place context and examine it there . . . . The situation is not nearly as threatening to the teacher as a generalization made by you (the supervisor) conveying the message of a trend over time, which may appear to be irreversible. For example, speak about "the teacher's score (of 2 low) on the classroom (discipline) dimension of an evaluation form on Monday, 5th May, 1980," rather than "the teacher always seems to be dull and pedestrian when (spring) rolls around."

Indeed, as Tuckman (1976:341) postulates, "That is why numbers (i.e., quantifications) help . . . . You should talk 'this much' of a quality now versus 'that much' of the quality then . . . ."

6. Effective supervisory feedback should be well-timed. "Feedback should be focussed on the present rather than the past" (Hyman, 1975:147). Feedback, which is related to remembered teaching situations is meaningful. There are, however, exceptions to this "rule" because "other variables, such as the teacher's emotional state and yours (supervisor's)" should be taken into consideration:

> . . . it is important for the supervisor to be aware of the emotional state of the student teacher. . . . It often becomes necessary to deal with these emotions before the conferences can be as productive as they should. In many cases, a "breathing space" is necessary between the teaching of the lesson and the conference. The supervisor's observation notes allow the lesson to be recreated, so the conference does not have to follow immediately (Education Practicum Handbook, 1979-80:51).

Moreover, the Education Practicum Handbook (1979-80:51) has this to say:

> It is necessary to make a distinction between the more formal conferences . . . and the more casual discussions between supervisor and student teacher which will occur on a regular, if "ad hoc" basis. While these "formal" conferences are time-consuming, they would seem to be fundamental to the improvement of teaching on the part of the student teacher. Conferences should be held for specific purposes and will vary with the abilities of the student teacher, the nature of his teaching assignment, the amount of his experience, and the time available. As a general rule, however, it is hoped that cooperating teachers and student teachers will have a full conference at least twice per week, while recognizing variations due to the factors listed above. In addition, supervisors can make use of the principles discussed above, in their more casual "ad hoc" discussions with the student teacher.

Mosher and Purple (1972:97) however, have this to suggest regarding the timing of the conference:

> The crucial phase in the analysis of instruction is the conference following the teaching. If the conference occurs immediately after the teaching, the perceptions and feelings of both supervisor and teacher are still fresh and acute. There can be disadvantages to an immediate conference, however. Feelings may be too acute (the teacher may be discouraged or defensive or "unobjective"). Further, the supervisor is at a distinct disadvantage if he does not have enough time to review the data derived from observation and to begin the process of making tentative inferences and deciding what the data appear to say about the content, the method of teaching and what the children are learning. He needs time, too, to decide upon a plan or agenda for the supervision session. Sufficient time, then, for the supervisor and teacher to think, and for the teacher to catch his breath emotionally, is very important to the outcome of the conference itself.

After observation, the supervisor needs time to prepare - both his/her data and him/herself - in order to be of most help to the student teacher. Thus, this stage allows the supervisor to: structure the data to make it intelligible and manageable; plan the supervisory conference in a more objective way; show the student teacher, by his/her planning, that he/she, the supervisor, is concerned; and, let time intercede to calm down possible raised emotions on both sides that may have occurred during observation.

7. Effective supervisory feedback should be in terms of shared information. As mentioned earlier, clinical supervision supports a helping relationship between the supervisor and the student teacher. This implies sharing of information (and ideas) rather than giving advice.

Hyman (1975:147) states that:

> If the feedback is shared information, then the teacher is free to use it as he sees fit in light

> of your (supervisor's) overall conference comments. If you (supervisor) give advice (or dictate your ideas), you are telling the teacher what to do. This sets up a threatening situation, since you show yourself to be better than he is by removing his freedom of action. For example, speak about "the teacher examining the data with you on the fifteen questions he asked" rather than "I think you ought to ask more questions of those three cheerleaders sitting in the back of the room."

Blumberg (1974:92-94) has given examples of sharing information as follows:

> Included here are statements that clarify, build on, or develop ideas or suggestions by the (student) teacher. This behaviour would be demonstrated if the (supervisor) responds to the student (teacher's) ideas by participating in the development of the ideas or by agreeing with the idea as it is presented. For example, a student might want to implement a teaching strategy which had been taught at the college or which he had developed. The (supervisor) would either agree that the idea be implemented or would ask the student to elaborate on the idea and would assist him in operationalizing it, assuming it was feasible.

8. Effective supervisory feedback should emphasize alternative approaches to teaching. Feedback should focus on alternative approaches rather than the "one best" path towards improvement of the student teacher's performance (Education Practicum Handbook, 1979-80:50; Hyman, 1975:148). "For example," reports Hyman, "speak about increasing (the use of) small groups and/or providing more activities, and/or using mini-units so as to appeal to more students" rather than "the best way to get students to participate is to put them into small groups with their own leaders."

9. Effective supervisory feedback should focus on ideas phrased in "more or less" terms. Hyman (1975:148) suggests that feedback should focus on "information and ideas phrased in terms of 'more or less' rather than 'either or' (or not at all) and further explains that:

> More or less terminology shows that there is a continuum along which the teacher's actions fall (allowing room for improvement). Either-or terminology connotes an absolute situation of two extremes without any middle ground . . . . The many complex variables in teaching require us (supervisors) to keep a sliding continuum in mind without a predetermined extreme position. For example, speak about "asking less questions per lesson" rather than "either the teacher or the students should question but not both."

10. Effective supervisory feedback should be based on the receiver's needs. Feedback should focus on what the receiver (the student teacher) needs rather than on what the sender (supervisor) needs to get off his chest (Hyman, 1975:148). Hyman writes that "since the purpose of feedback is to alert the teacher about his performance, you (the supervisor) must keep him (the student teacher) in mind." Fuller and Manning (1973:509) have observed that feedback can be effective when, among other considerations:

> . . . the (student) teacher either spontaneously or through focus (prompting) identifies discrepancies between (a) her experienced and observed performance; (b) her observations and observations of the focuser (supervisor); (c) her goals and the goals of the focuser (supervisor); (d) her observed performance and mutually agreed upon goals.

The Education Practicum Handbook (1979-80:50) has this to say:

> The planning sessions (preobservation conferences) dealt with hypotheses about what would occur in the classroom. The teaching of the lesson was to be the "test" of these hypotheses. The conference (post-observation) discussion should deal with the question of whether the student (teacher) behaved (and learned) as expected and the factors that might have altered it.

Blumberg (1974:92-94) adds that:

> This category includes all negative value judgements about the (student) teacher, his behaviour in the classroom, any behaviour on the part of the supervisor that can be interpreted as defensive, aggressive, or tension producing. Examples of non-supportive behaviour on the part of the (supervisor) would be comments about the student's physical appearance or his stated values and goals. For example, "With all the competition for teaching positions, _you_ (the student teacher) will have a hard time getting a job."

Hyman (1975:148) therefore suggests the following:

> Even though you (the supervisor) may have several things on your mind which will impart a sense of release to you, your first consideration must be the meaningfulness of the feedback to the teacher. If you (the supervisor) must get a few things off your chest perhaps a separate conference or casual meeting would be better so as to differentiate the _feedback_ sessions from your _release_ session.

11. _Effective supervisory feedback should focus on selected and manageable items_. Fuller and Manning (1973:509) have postulated that feedback can be effective "when discrepancies focussed upon are moderate rather than large or small." In the _Education Practicum Handbook_ (1979-80:50) it states:

> In each conference, it is probably far more effective to deal with a _limited number of items_ - _perhaps two or three_. This gives the student teacher a clear focus for future lessons. A "grocery list" of items is usually overwhelming and unproductive.

Specifically, any single "conference should include not more than four or five items" according to Kyte (1962: 168) and as Amidon, Kies and Palisi (1966:56-57) have suggested any single supervisory feedback should be:

> concerned with specific (selected) teaching acts, not with (large) generalized interpretations. It can be concerned legitimately with the manner of questioning used, manner of responding to students, pace, or some other pattern of communication.

Goldhammer (1969) suggests as well that the selection of items to be discussed in the post-observation conferences should be guided by the principles of saliency (dealing with the most predominant or most frequently occurring features), treatability (features about which something can be done), and fewness (manageability). According to Goldhammer, these three principles suggest that the supervisor should use the following guidelines for the selection of items:

1. Select areas for which data are available so that items can be dealt with concretely, not through inference.

2. Select bits of behavior that are exemplary of larger conceptual categories: focus on smaller items, then show the relationship to the whole.

3. Use comparison and contrast to make data more meaningful for teacher.

4. Be cautious of dealing with too many emotion-laden issues in one conference, and instead, steer a course for balance.

5. Consider the element of time.

6. Consider the element of energy. Both supervisor and teacher must pace themselves and not try to deal with too much at once.

7. Present data in a logical order.

12. Effective supervisory feedback should focus on modifiable teaching behaviors. Hyman (1975:148) states that feedback should focus on

> modifiable items rather than on what the teacher cannot do anything about . . . . By focussing on what he can modify, you (the supervisor) offer him the opportunity to change and feel successful. This will create a positive atmosphere about feedback. For example, speak about "possible ways of rearranging the student's desks" rather than "the loud clicking of the clock disturbed some students."

"Feedback is offered only in areas that are susceptible to change by the recipient" (Amidon, Kies, and Palisi, 1966: 56-67); "when disrupted behaviour is recognized (by both supervisor and student teacher) as part of the change process" (Fuller and Manning, 1973:509) and "when treatments (in the form of alternative suggestions) are provided to establish new or desired behaviours" (Fuller and Manning, 1973:509).

Treatments may be in the form of:

> a clear ideal, model of what his (student teacher's) behaviour characteristics should be (for example, competencies or skills required of him); a "teaching philosophy"; or the feedback recipient's knowledge of what others (students, supervisors, community, employing agencies, etc.) expectations of him are (Tuckman, 1976:341).

The recipient (student teacher) should also know what he expects of himself and be able to make a personal commitment to change for the improvement of his performance.

An example of this category suggested by Blumberg (1974:92-94) would be when ". . . an unsatisfactory behaviour or problem has been suggested by the supervisor and the student is asked for his opinions or suggestions to remediate the behaviour or problem" (related to sub-section 10 above).

13. Effective supervisory practices should encourage the recipients to initiate feedback sessions. When the student teacher has concerns or goals related to teaching, he should be encouraged through a trustworthy, helping relationship to request feedback from the supervisor on certain aspects. As Hyman (1975:149) states, the student teacher's "request is a sign of interest and care" which in turn can serve as a spring-board into other meaningful aspects of supervision. For example, a supervisor who is requested to provide feedback is also receiving feedback from the sender as to his effectiveness as a supervisor.

14. An effective supervisory session should end with a summary of the main points raised during the session. "Feedback" on the feedback sessions is just as important. Hyman (1975:149) suggests that the supervisor should "check the feedback he gives by asking the student teacher to summarize points for both of them . . . ." This eliminates or minimizes any discrepancies in the perceptions of both the supervisor and the student teacher of what the conference session was all about and provides a clearer focus for the

next lesson.

15. An effective supervisory session should be held in a place which assures the recipient's privacy. The Education Practicum Handbook (1979-80:51) states:

> Very definitely, conferences should occur in a situation where privacy is ensured as much as possible. The staff room is the least desirable setting. The presence of a third party who "drops by" can be most unsettling. Much of the value of the conferences depends on the quality of the relationship between supervisor and student teacher, so interruption and distractions from others must be minimized. An exception to this point, of course, is a planned three-way conference among cooperating teacher, faculty consultant, and student teacher.

The 15 principles of effective feedback reviewed above were restructured and stated in the form of 15 questions in order to appropriately address the relevant research question (question 1). The 15 questions generated from the above review were also used in the training session (see Chapter 3). The questions are:

1. To what extent is the supervisor supportive of the student teacher during the feedback session?

2. To what extent does the feedback being offered emphasize actual patterns of performance rather than personal qualities?

3. To what extent is the feedback focussed on observations rather than assumptions, inferences, or interpretations?

4. To what extent is the feedback focussed on description rather than evaluation of the student teacher's

performance?

5. To what extent does the feedback focus on specific, concrete behaviors, rather than the general and abstract?

6. To what extent is the feedback session well timed, all things being considered, rather than poorly timed?

7. To what extent does the feedback focus on sharing information rather than on giving advice?

8. To what extent does the feedback provide alternative approaches that will allow the student teacher to improve rather than offer the best path to improvement?

9. To what extent does the feedback focus on information and ideas phrased in terms of "more or less" (or some such terms) rather than "either-or"?

10. To what extent does the feedback, including negative criticism, focus on what the student teacher needs for improvement of performance rather than on what the supervisor needs to get off his/her (supervisor's) chest?

11. To what extent does the feedback focus on selected items that the student teacher can use and manage rather than on all the information the supervisor has gathered?

12. To what extent does the feedback focus on modifiable behaviors rather than on what the teacher cannot do anything about?

13. To what extent do the feedback sessions emphasize items requested by the student teachers rather than those

imposed by the supervisors?

14. To what extent is an attempt made at the end of the conference to check on the feedback given by asking the student teacher to summarize the main points or ideas raised between the student teacher and supervisor during the session?

15. To what extent does the place of meeting provide privacy during the conference sessions rather than interruptions and distractions?

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO THE SUBSTANCE (TOPIC AREAS) OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK

The purpose of this section is to generate an acceptable framework for analyzing the content of supervisory feedback. Various classifications of effective teaching and some existing category listings are focussed on. Subsequent components are utilized in the generation of the ten items included in the Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B). Mosher and Purple (1972:92-96) have observed that in Clinical Supervision, effective teaching tends to be classified and discussed in terms of such factors as:

1) The teacher's ability to communicate, for example, audibility, coherence of presentation, the transitions, and degree of abstraction in his/her language.

2) Logic of the teaching strategy or method employed,

3) The teacher's performance of "instrumental

tasks" for example, collecting and distributing papers, having enough or extra pencils, talking to the board, readability of handwriting, and, attempting to conduct a group discussion with the desks arranged so rigidly that children must speak to each other's backs.

4. The motivational effect of teaching such that it is either dull or imaginative and stimulating or the teacher does or does not communicate commitment to and intellectual enthusiasm about the content.

5. The quality of the personal relationship established between the teacher and his pupils.

Carl Rogers (1951; 1961; 1967) has argued that "the quality of interpersonal relationship established between the teacher and the learner has a more significant effect on learning outcome than any other variable." Among the variables which contribute to such feelings as interpersonal anxiety, fear, like of dislike of the teacher are the predictability of his relationships with children, the types of rewards and/or punishments he employs, and his statements about what is right or wrong in children's behavior, in and out of class.

Brown (1961:227-252) in his study of stressful supervision, traced the effects of failure stress not only to personal attributes, but also examined it with respect to each of several components of effective teaching which he identified as: personal qualities or attributes; evidence of preparation for teaching; manner of presenting the lesson;

contact with pupils; and classroom management. The following are brief descriptions of the components used by Brown in his study.

1. Personal Qualities (PQ) include poise, voice, manner, professional interests, and attitude.

2. Preparation for Teaching (PT) refers to general evidence in academic knowledge, suitability of lesson, materials, and use of effective planning.

3. Presentation of Lesson (PL) comprises observed resourcefulness, effectiveness of methods, adaptability, and command of the English language.

4. Contact with Pupils (CP) includes such necessary teaching behavior as showing sensitivity to the pupil's reactions during the lesson, adjusting the content and method to the grade level of the class being taught, and the manner the teacher uses for helping individual pupils with their difficulties. It does not necessarily imply physical contact, but rather, the interpersonal relations set up between teacher and pupil to improve the learning situation.

5. Classroom Management (M), because it is achieved in a variety of ways according to the individual teacher, is difficult to define. Some practise it, and evaluate it in terms of rigid routine; others see it as synonymous with one use of the term 'discipline' and still others, claiming that effective management is a function of rapport and personal relations, refer to effectiveness in classroom management as a composite of all the good qualities in

teaching. Brown (1961:239) defines classroom management as referring to ". . . control of the class and the activities of individual pupils, efficient manner of giving directions and handling routine matters, and the manner of keeping records."

6. Content of Lesson is an important category of observation. Clinical supervision's method of analyzing content is discussed in the planning phase. It is at this point that predictions made in advance of the lesson about the suitability of content, the clarity and precision of its communication, its motivational characteristics and the like, are studied in terms of actual observed teaching.

Brown (1961:262) concludes that stressful supervision affects the several components of the teaching process differentially:

> (i) the more personal aspects of teaching (use of personal qualities, contact with pupils) deteriorate the most
> (ii) the more 'bookish' aspects of teaching (evidence of preparation for lesson, lesson plans, evidence of subject-matter knowledge) deteriorate the least, and in fact improve
> (iii) the more traditionally pedagogical aspects of teaching (classroom management, presentation of lesson) deteriorate to an extent somewhere between the other two, approximately to the same degree as general teaching effectiveness
> (iv) the more intelligent the teacher, the more she/he deteriorates in effectiveness of classroom management and contact with pupils.

Two other research findings which bear some relevance to this section are worth citing, however. Swineford (1964), for example, studied the supervisor's suggestions to student teachers concerning the improvement of their teaching. When supervisors do talk about teaching, their recommendations apparently run pretty much as one might expect. In order of decreasing frequency the supervisors in the Swineford study talked about teaching techniques and procedures, discipline and control, development of a classroom personality, planning of units or particular lessons and development of a sound academic background. The low priority given curriculum questions is noteworthy.

A similar, though less rigorous, study of the supervisory conference was undertaken by Kyte (1962). Thirty sets of tape recordings, made up of a lesson observed by a supervisor, a follow-up conference and a subsequent lesson, were collected and carefully analyzed. The teachers involved taught at all elementary grade levels, in most subject areas and in both urban and rural schools. Kyte was interested in the optimal number of items discussed in the supervision conference and in the degree of emphasis which should be given to each.

Kyte's (1962:168) main conclusions regarding the nature of the supervisory conference based on observed teaching are as follows:

1. The conference should include not more than four or five items.

2. The first main item in the conference should be planned to establish rapport and consequently should be given only minor stress or passing mention.

3. The second and third items in the conference

should be given major stress. If there is any difference in the amount of stress, the third item should receive the greatest stress.

4. The fourth item in the conference should be given either major stress or minor stress, depending on the degree of influence desired on the subsequent teaching.

5. The fifth point in the conference should be given either minor stress or passing mention and generally should be related to one of the preceding items.

6. The last point introduced into the conference should be given either minor stress or passing mention. It should have a pleasing effect on the teacher irrespective of its influence on subsequent teaching.

7. When a number of items are included in a conference some of them should be related to each other. The relatedness should be included especially when two or more major items are treated.

8. Repetition in the discussion of a major point should increase its effectiveness on subsequent teaching. The repetition can occur in a brief review of the item at or near the end of the conference.

Kyte's findings are by no means conclusive. For example, the assumption that a definite format and ordering of topics is effective for all supervisory conferences seems questionable. While it would be a mistake to apply his findings literally, Kyte's study is unique in its attempt to measure the effect of the content of supervisory feedback by the criterion of changes in the subsequent teaching.

The various components of effective teaching reviewed above seem to be in line with the teaching strategies identified by and used in the Project QUEST, a joint research project between the Centre for Research in Teaching (CRT) at the University of Alberta and the Edmonton Public School Board (EPSB) in the 1978-79 period. The set of 28 strategies used in the Project QUEST fell into four main clusters: classroom management; organization and methodological strategies; verbal interaction strategies; and interpersonal interaction strategies. The paramount criterion used for the selection of the strategies for the Project QUEST was the existence of research support in the literature review and expert opinion.

A comparison of category listings from Brown (1961), Mosher and Purpel (1972) and Project QUEST (1978-79) is presented in Table 1.

The category listings reviewed above may not be exhaustive because of what Ratsoy (1979:36) termed as "the lack of a generally accepted framework for classifying competencies," the same observation researchers of the early 1950's like Barr and Morsh (cited in Medley, 1971:12) made that:

> No single, specific, observable teacher act has yet been found whose frequency or percent of occurrence is invariably significantly correlated with student achievement. . . .

The categories, however, provided useful insight into the

TABLE 1

Teaching Effectiveness Components: A Comparison

BROWN (1961)	MOSHER AND PURPEL (1972)	Project QUEST (MacKay, 1978-79)
1. Personal Qualities (PQ) -- poise, voice, manner, professional interest, attitude.	1. Ability to communicate -- audibility, coherence of presentation, the transitions, degree of abstraction in language used. 2. The Motivational Effect of Teaching -- either dull or imaginative and stimulating, does or does not communicate commitment to and intellectual enthusiasm about the content.	1. Verbal Interaction Strategies
2. Preparation for Teaching (PT) -- general evidence of academic knowledge, suitability of lesson materials, use of effective instructional planning.	2. Content -- knowledge of material, suitability of content/method, correctiveness of communication and/or language, subject matter documents and nature of assignments.	2. Organizational and Methodological Strategies
3. Presentation of Lesson (PL) -- observed resourcefulness, effectiveness of methods, adaptability, command of English language.	3. Logic of teaching strategy/method, questioning skills.	
4. Contact with Pupils (P) -- sensitivity to pupils, reactions during the lesson, interpersonal relationships, manner of helping pupils, meeting individual pupil/grade level needs.	4. The quality of personal relationships between teacher and pupil	3. Interpersonal Interaction Strategies
5. Classroom Management (M) -- discipline, handling routine tasks, keeping records, conducting activities with individual pupils, giving directions.	5. Performance of "instrumental tasks" -- conducting successful group discussions, collecting and distributing papers, pencils, etc., talking to the chalk board, handwriting.	4. Classroom Management and Control Strategies

construction of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B), the details of which are discussed in Chapter 3 of the study. Noteworthy, however, is the fact that clarity and simplicity were the major criteria for deriving the categories included in the instrument. Any categories which were ambiguous, inappropriate or inapplicable to the sample of the study were otherwise deleted, revised or restated based on various procedures described in Chapter 3.

The resulting ten topics used in the study were defined as follows:

1. Personal Qualities

(a) Communication Skills: Ability to communicate. Audibility; voice; coherence of presentation; manner; the transitions; degree of abstraction in language used; poise.

(b) Professional Qualities: Interest in work; attitude toward supervision; responsibility to professional requirements.

(c) Motivational Effect of Teaching: Either dull or imaginative and stimulating; does or does not communicate commitment to and intellectual enthusiasm about content.

2. Instructional Planning

General evidence of academic knowledge; use of effective and appropriate lesson and unit plans.

3. Content of Lesson

Knowledge of material taught or subject matter, suitability of lesson materials, documents and the nature of problems (assignments) posed in class, correctiveness of content in relation to stated objectives for lesson being taught.

4. Presentation of Lesson

Logic of instruction; observed resourcefulness; adaptability; command of English language; questioning skills; sense of humor; effectiveness of methods used; effective use of chalkboard, texts, effective use of Audio Visual Materials.

5. Quality of Interpersonal Relationships

Contact with pupils; sensitivity to pupils' response behaviors; reactions during the lesson; the quality of personal relationships between teacher and pupils.

6. Classroom Management

Handling "routine" or "instructional" tasks -- keeping records; giving directions; conducting activities with individual or groups of pupils; collecting and distributing papers, pencils, books, manner of helping pupils with assignments; meeting individual pupil or grade level needs.

7. Discipline in the Classroom

8. Review of Performance

General comments on overall performance of teacher, pupils; observed improvements or growth of teacher, etc.

9. Informal Conversation

Weather, politics, etc.

10. Others

Any other topics not falling under the above.

The ten topics above were included in the Post-

Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B) in an attempt to answer the second research question of the study: "What were the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions during the student teaching period as recorded by the researcher in relation to the seven sub-problems listed under Question 2 in Chapter 1 of the study?"

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO TYPOLOGIES OF SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES

The review of literature in this section is presented under two sub-headings. First, an overview of existing schema adopted in various supervisory techniques in the supervision of student teaching is provided. Second, some typologies or styles of supervisory conferences are explored.

Overview of Supervision

Henry and Beasley (1972) have observed that the two basic dimensions of the teaching act are the interpersonal relationships and the process of instruction. The former concerns the relationship between the teacher and the pupils in the classroom and involves attitudes, values and emotions. The latter concerns the teacher's knowledge of the basic procedures for selecting relevant learning experiences for the pupils and experimenting with them to develop effective teaching strategies.

The interpersonal relationships and the process of instruction are interdependent and the supervisor's responsibility is to effectively assist the student teacher to integrate the interpersonal with the instructional. This task involves guiding, supporting and teaching the student teacher and is known as supervision (Ebel, 1969:1381).

Most techniques of supervision can be generally represented on a very simple three-stage schema:

1	2	3
Pre-Planning	Record of Teaching	Post-Event Analysis

Sometimes, this is augmented by a further two stages in which the supervisory conference is recorded in some fashion and a post-event analysis of that, too, is included for the further training of supervisors themselves or for providing feedback to them. The basic supervision of students, however, remains as above, too often, concentrating on areas 2 and 3. Indeed, there are many instances where stage 2 is given tremendous emphasis by the physical presence of a note-taking supervisor, while the post-event analysis, stage 3, is a mere five minutes in a corridor. Varying emphases on the three stages provide a schema for even the most sophisticated supervisory techniques (Cope, 1974:15). Thus, clinical supervision, as advocated by Goldhammer (1969) is a rigorous implementation of the above schema.

Interaction analysis systems, when their purpose is diagnostic, may deal with stages 2 and 3 only. Counselling techniques of supervision may concentrate solely on stage 3, utilizing the version of events presented by the client (student).

The length and type of the teaching episode may vary. The means of making a record may range from written notes or filling in schedules to a video tape. The post-event analysis (stage 3) will be conditioned by the nature of the record kept. Yet basically supervision, whatever its form, is concerned with these stages.

Since the faculty consultant and cooperating teacher are in a supervisory role in relation to the student teacher, it is reasonable to assume that the effective supervisor would practise the supervision approach which is represented in this excerpt from Wiles (1955:9):

> The supervisor's role has become supporting, assisting, and sharing, rather than directing. The authority of the supervisor's position has not decreased, but it is used in another way. It is to promote growth through assuming responsibility and creativity rather than through dependency and conformity.

The critics of practice teaching are concerned about student teachers being socialized to the status quo, that is, encouraged to be dependent and to conform. The supporting, assisting, and sharing concepts which are perceived as facilitating personal growth are characteristic of a "helping relationship" which has been espoused by humanistic psychologists such as Allport (1955); Combs (1974); Glasser (1963, 1969); Gordon (1974); Maslow (1943, 1962); and Rogers (1951, 1961, 1967). Combs was largely responsible for introducing the humanistically oriented teacher education programme which replaced the traditional one at the

University of Florida in Gainesville. Both Glasser and Gordon worked with classroom teachers and their books are required in pre-service teacher education programmes in some teacher education institutions.

Rogers (1961) defines the helping relationship as one in which at least one of the parties has the intent of promoting growth, development, maturity, improved functioning, and improved coping with the life of the other. He observed that the therapeutic relationship in psychotherapy is but a specific instance of interpersonal relationships in general, and that this approach applies to all helping relationships. Cannell and Kahn (1968:526) have pointed out that the therapeutic interview can be a powerful source of help. Its purpose is to change the behavior of the person, and its success is defined in terms of changes (as is the conference between the supervisor and student teacher).

The helping relationship which has been defined by Rogers (1961) has also been expressed in Kuhn's (1962) recommendations for the conducting of a successful professional interview and these recommendations may have implications for the supervisor and student teacher conference which is a type of interview. Kuhn (1962:203) suggests that the interviewer (supervisor) regard the social act (post-observation conference) "as the context in which the individual discovers himself and establishes his own identity." This approach, which represents the symbolic interactionist perspective, involves the interviewer (supervisor) helping the client (student teacher) to review his behavior, evaluate it, and consider alternative forms of behavior which would lead to a more successful performance. This process parallels Glasser's (1963) Reality Therapy approach.

Kuhn's (1962) recommendations are congruent with Shaplin's (1962) belief that the primary purpose of practice teaching is that the student teacher learns to analyze, criticize, and control his own behavior. There is considerable empirical support to substantiate the proposition that the higher the level of facilitative conditions in the counselling interview, the greater the likelihood of successful outcome (Anthony, 1971) especially in the field of education.

The perspectives of the helping relationship which are advocated by Kuhn (1962) and Shaplin (1962) may be combined and restated in the context of the supervisor and student teacher interaction in the post-observation conference situation. The supervisor views the interaction with a student teacher as one in which the student teacher is helped to discover himself and to develop his identity as a teacher through assisting the student teacher to review and analyze his teaching performance, criticize and evaluate it, and to learn to control his own behavior by identifying alternative forms of behavior which will lead to a more successful teaching performance.

A teaching/learning model which appears to facilitate the accomplishment of the combined Kuhn and Shaplin perspectives is that of "andragogy". This has been espoused by Knowles (1970) and Knox (1974), among others. Andragogy is defined as the art and science of helping adults to learn as opposed to pedagogy which is the art and science of teaching children. The fact that today's student teachers are adults has been stated and their desire to be treated as adults or peers is indicated in the literature.

Ingalls (1973) describes the pedagogical model as one in which the teacher views the learner as dependent and having limited experience which must be augmented under the teacher's direction. The content of the learning experience is subject centred and the teacher provides pupil motivation through external rewards and punishments and competitive learning climate. On the other hand, the andragogy model requires the teacher to view the student as increasingly self-directed and as a person who has a rich resource for learning within himself. The content of the learning experience tends to be task and/or problem centred and the student is assumed to be self-motivated or directed. Gibb (1969) identifies problem solving and equality communication behavior as indicative of supportiveness given to the recipient of such behaviors, consequently inducing desirable behavior on the part of the recipient.

The development, organization and administration of the andragogical teaching/learning model is described by Ingalls (1973) as involving a continuous circular application of the following elements:

1. Setting (and maintaining) a climate of mutual trust.
2. Establishing (and maintaining) a structure for mutual planning.
3. Assessing interests, needs, and values.
4. Formulating goals and objectives.
5. Planning learning activities.
6. Implementing learning activities.
7. Evaluating the degree to which planned objectives have been achieved through analysis of objective data. Evaluation is shared and leads to a reassessment of needs (feedback).

The contemporary teaching/learning model in teacher education and specifically in the field experience, which most closely resembles the andragogy model, is clinical supervision.

The clinical supervision model which has been espoused by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1972) emphasizes the supervisor in the helping role to foster analytical, rational, and professional behavior in student teachers. The term clinical is borrowed from the medical profession and the approach attempts to apply the face-to-face, data based instructional supervision given to medical interns to the student teacher in the classroom. The Association for Student Teaching (1970) supports the clinical supervision approach and the Association perceives practice teaching as a clinical study of teaching which is described as:

> . . . a continuous exploration and examination of educational possibilities in particular settings under varying conditions. (The clinical study of teaching) is not a static exercise in the demonstration of established ways. It is instead a constant quest for productive curricular plans and imaginative teaching strategies through experimentation, coordinated analytical assessment, and the consideration of alternative approaches.

This position elaborates on Wiles' (1955) definition of supervision which is to promote the student's growth through assuming responsibility and the exercise of creativity rather than through dependency and conformity.

The process of clinical supervision is cyclical, as is that of the andragogy teaching/learning model, and can be summarized as follows:

1. A pre-observation conference in which the student shares instructional goals with the supervisor. They jointly clarify goals, objectives and determine how to assess the extent to which goals may be achieved (items 1 to 5 in the andragogy model referred to earlier are included here).

2. The supervisor observes the student's teaching and collects data through note-taking or tape-recording (item 6 of the andragogy model).

3. The supervisor analyzes the data and prepares strategies for the post-observation conference.

4. The post-observation conference is where data

are shared with the objective of using a data base to identify discrepancies between the student's intent and action. The student is assisted in developing insight with regards to himself as a teacher and the teaching process.

5. Joint planning of future goals (item 7 in the andragogy model is represented by items 4 and 5 in the clinical supervision model).

It is on the Post-Observation Conference stage that this study focusses.

Typologies of Supervisory Conferences

The first prerequisite for a scheduled conference is that there be something to discuss so as to provide a focus for initial meetings. When the supervisor and the student teacher come together, they have a definite topic to consider.

Once there is a mutually understood reason for meeting, interpersonal relations become important. What kind of interaction is desirable? Conference style may be divided into three types, as identified by Clothier and Kingsley (1973):

1. Supervisor-Directed Conference. This style is frequently used in supervisory conferences. Studies indicate that supervising teachers talk about sixty-five percent of the time during conferences, do not accept the students' ideas and tend to be critical of the student teachers. Since the student teaching term is short and there

is so much to do, it is understandable that the supervisor might be tempted to use this style. Student teachers often encourage this approach. Realizing their inadequacy and desiring to please, student teachers are sometimes hesitant to make suggestions or disagree with their supervisors.

It is also possible that some supervising teachers feel a need to mould the student teachers into their image; hence, they insist that their directions be followed without question. Others have developed successful techniques and out of a desire for their student teacher to succeed unconsciously exert gentle but persistent pressure on the student teacher to accept their point of view. Their efforts provide a high degree of certainty but little room for student teacher creativity. Whatever the reasons, certain behaviors can be associated with both supervisor and student teacher in supervisor-directed conferences:

Supervising Teacher	Student Teacher
Supervisor dominates	Student teacher is passive
Supervisor does most of the talking	Student teacher is sensitive to her own inadequacy in knowledge and experience
Gives directions	Has few ideas and makes few suggestions
Expects student teacher to accept her point of view	Agrees with supervisor unfailingly
Tries to mould student teacher into her own image	May become increasingly dependent on supervisor
Critical of student	Hesitant to ask questions

teacher	
Doesn't listen to student teacher's ideas	May become hostile and resist supervisor's directiveness

The postulated outcomes of this mode of interaction are that the student teacher will work with a high degree of certainty but will experience minimal growth and there is a possibility of confrontation if the student teacher expresses his personal goals and ideas for teaching.

2. Non-directed Conference. Sometimes supervising teachers, not wanting to be labelled authoritarian, will over-react, moving to a laissez-faire type of conference behavior. There could be a number of reasons for the decision to adopt this conference style.

Some supervisors may be unsure of their relationship with the student teacher and other college personnel. In such cases, it is doubtful that a supervising teacher will take the risk of alienating college personnel by assuming a strong leadership role. A few supervisors may view a student teacher as someone to provide relief from a heavy teaching load and offer little in the way of guidance. Other supervisors may feel uncomfortable in the presence of a bright, young person who has had training in all the latest techniques espoused by professional education courses. The danger of suggesting techniques which may be obsolete in the view of the latest textbook theory can be a real threat.

A supervisor who adopts the non-directive style tends to make few suggestions, gives minimal constructive criticism, praises indiscriminately, and focusses on feelings. In this situation, the student teacher may work with a high degree of uncertainty because no real feedback is given about his teaching performance and, as such, his behavior may be changed but it will be on the basis of feelings rather than on an analysis and evaluation of his actual teaching experience. This conference style, though unlikely to result in significant growth, will probably not result in conflict but a conscientious student teacher who wants to learn to teach will probably be very frustrated because he will often be unsure of his progress.

Out of a sincere desire to encourage rather than deflate a student teacher's feelings, some supervising teachers will praise indiscriminately, use vague supportive generalities, but fail to point out weaknesses or suggest alternative strategies for possible improvement that are so necessary to a student teacher's growth. One of the most frequent criticisms made by student teachers regarding conferences is that supervising teachers fail to provide constructive criticism of teaching behaviors.

Clothier and Kingsley (1973) have observed that some supervisors praise indiscriminately and fail to point out weaknesses or suggest strategies for improvement of teaching performance, i.e., provide constructive criticism. Indiscriminate praise is that given without a reason, such as "good performance," with no qualifier or what appears to be a pattern of making positive comments as a matter of course in the supervisor's verbal behavior. We may characterize behaviors inherent in this style of conference in the following way:

Supervising Teacher	Student Teacher
Makes few or no suggestions	Works with a large degree of uncertainty about performance
Gives little constructive criticism	Changes behavior on the basis of feelings rather than analysis of task
Praises indiscriminately	Frustrated from lack of direction
Listens and may even "psychologize" student teacher	Feels free to ask questions
Offers little guidance but gives tasks to do	Assumes responsibility for self-direction
May be hypercritical of others in the building	Asks for help but receives little satisfaction
Need for reassurance may cause her to solicit student teacher support	
Interested in feelings	

3. Interactive Conference. This conference style appears to yield the most positive results. It is problem rather than personality centred. The primary emphasis is on improving teaching behavior through the use of objective data. Since it requires an open and honest relationship, the activities are geared towards facilitation of the interaction between the participants.

Each participant should feel free to recommend topics for discussion. Each must be able to offer suggestions for solutions to problems. It is ideas that are to be evaluated. The supervising teacher does not feel the need to "put down" the creative ideas of a student teacher to protect a position of authority. The focus is on improved practice rather than position or personalities. Participants share the responsibility for successful conferences.

Obviously the supervising teacher must feel secure enough to permit and even encourage disagreement. Likewise, the student teacher must be willing to accept other points of view. A student teaching experience cannot be truly effective without an honest interchange between the supervisor and the supervisee. Thus, the observable behaviors in this conference style will be:

Supervising Teacher	Student Teacher
Gives constructive suggestions and ideas	Offers own ideas
Feedback is objective based on student teacher's intentions or acceptable analysis measures	Clarifies own ideas and actions
Supervisor solicits and accepts student teacher's ideas and opinions	Accepts supervisor's questions and suggestions
	Gives suggestions for modification of teaching behavior and team relations
Praises disciminately	Reflects on own performance and evaluates according to intended purpose and acceptable

	measures for analysis
Guides student teacher in figuring out own problems and teaching strategies	Asks for supervisor's suggestions or ideas
Listens to what student teacher has to say	
Asks for clarification	

The manifest behaviors identified in the interactive conference model appear to specify in behavioral terms the conditions required in a post-observation conference which is representative of the clinical supervision approach. The conditions are a problem-centred approach which involves sharing data. The objective is to identify discrepancies between the supervisor's and student teacher's intent and action, and to plan remedial behavior to reduce the discrepancies.

An impressive amount of research findings have documented the importance of nondirective techniques in any helping relationship (Brammer, 1973; Carkhuff, 1969, 1972). Several authors (Oliva, 1976; Salek, 1975) have also suggested that nondirective (or indirect) techniques are likely to be more productive in the teacher-supervisor relationship than directive techniques. Oliva (1976) has developed an argument in favour of the indirect supervisory approach basing his case on the assumption that humans, especially highly trained ones, are not motivated by authoritarian techniques. Salek (1975) suggests that supervisors caught in the helper versus evaluator role paradox, should employ nondirective techniques in both roles. Several studies have attempted to assess supervisee attitude toward directive and nondirective supervisory behavior with conflicing results. Blumberg and Weber, for example, (1968:110) surveyed 210 experienced teachers and found that:

> . . . . differences in teacher morale scores seem to be related to the amount of emphasis that teachers see their supervisors putting on indirect behavior in supervisory interaction.

Other studies have reported the reactions of student teachers to the process of supervision. Beginning teachers have been found to want suggestions (McConnell, 1960), constructive criticism of their teaching (Trimmer, 1960, 1961), regular conferences (Edmund and Hemink, 1958) and freedom to show initiative, and to dislike supervision which is disorganized, rigid or lacking in candor. Roth (1961) and Wright (1965) have also tried to distinguish between the supervisory activities regarded by beginning teachers as effective and ineffective. Their definitions are so general, however, (e.g., "reviewed the lesson for evaluative purposes") and the criteria so vague ("the effective supervising teacher has faith in himself") that it is difficult to draw many useful conclusions for practice.

A more sophisticated study of what supervisors do has been reported by Blumberg and Amidon (1965) who studied how "teachers perceive the [supervisory] conference, the supervisor's behavior and the apparent consequences." They collected 166 experienced teachers' views of actual and ideal supervisory conferences with principals. Adapting Flander's categories with reference to teaching, they asked each teacher to classify his supervisor with regard to the frequency of his "direct" behavior - giving information or opinion, directions and criticism - and his "indirect" behavior - accepting feelings and ideas, giving praise or encouragement and asking questions of the teacher. Secondly, the teachers were asked to evaluate their supervisors by the standards of "communicative freedom and supportiveness, learning outcome, amount of supervisory talk and general productivity in the supervisory conference."

The study's conclusions can be stated as follows: 1) When supervision is predominantly indirect (i.e., characterized by the eliciting and acceptance of the teacher's ideas and feelings and by positive reinforcement of the teacher), teachers tend to regard supervisory conferences as more productive. 2) Learning about one's self, both as a teacher and as a person, occurs when the supervisor evidences high indirect and high direct behavior. 3) Freedom of communication in a supervisory relationship is curtailed only when the supervisor is highly directive. 4) Teachers were most dissatisfied with supervisors who deemphasized indirect behavior.

From a survey of selected experienced teachers, Young and Heichberger (1975) on the other hand, have reported a clear preference for helper behavior (directive) over collegial behavior (nondirective). In their study of student teachers' perceptions of directive and nondirective supervisory behavior, Copeland and Atkinson (1978:123-126) have also found that the student teachers preferred directive supervisory behavior (typified by declarative and expository statements and an authoritarian posture) to nondirective supervisory behavior (typified by interrogatory and reflective statements and equalitarian posture). This outcome was somewhat surprising and contradictory in view of the extensive body of research documenting the effectiveness of nondirective techniques in the helping relationship (Brammer, 1973; Carkhuff, 1969). The results of this study also contradict those of Blumberg and Weber (1968) who employed experienced teachers as subjects.

Copeland and Atkinson (1978:123-126) have offered several explanations for the discrepancy between their results and the earlier studies, among them being: the preservice student teachers' need for an authority figure to provide quick, direct solutions to their problems as opposed to a rather self-sufficient, collegial attitude of experienced teachers (which contradicts Young and Heichberger's findings above); student teachers' desire to depend on and know the expectations of supervisors for grading, certification and tenure purposes as opposed to experienced teachers' feeling of security on the job, not depending entirely on the supervisors' evaluation. Furthermore, the slight modification of the methodology of the study would have contributed to the discrepancies. The sixty-six student teachers rated two tape recordings of a supervisory conference, one in which the supervisor was nondirective and the other in which he was very directive. The tape recordings were made as similar to each other as possible with the exception of nondirective and directive behavior, other personal qualities of supervisors being held constant. This methodology differed from those used in previous studies in which subjects were asked to recall nondirective and directive supervisory behavior without having their recollections colored by other personality and environmental variables. As a final note, the authors have cautioned that given the results of the study, supervisees' preferences for supervisory behaviors may or may not be directly related to supervisor effectiveness. Other factors may affect the supervisee's preferences. In addition to providing equivocal results, studies on indirect and direct supervisory behavior cited above suffer from the limitations inherent in most other survey research. Supervisory behavior judged by one respondent to be directive may be judged by another to be nondirective. Besides, survey studies require the respondent to express a preference from memory for one behavior over another; some subjects may recall a specific instance while others may respond on the basis of a general attitude. Furthermore, there is no way of knowing to what degree supervisor personality rather than supervisor behavior is being rated.

Despite the shortcomings noted above, and on the basis of extrapolations of the research on effective helper supervisory behavior, the view taken in this study is that supervisees (student teachers) would perceive the supervisor as more credible and useful when employing nondirective and interactive techniques than when employing directive techniques in the process of feedback during supervisory conferences.

Besides typifying supervisory conferences based on the conference styles above (Supervisor-Directed; Non-Directed; and Interactive) the purposes and objectives of supervisory conferences can also offer some very useful typologies.

Hunter (1980), for example, discusses four important generalizations that can be made about the different purposes and outcomes of supervisory conferences. First, Hunter (1980:408) recognizes that "supervisory conferences have two discrete functions . . . instructional and evaluative." Her second generalization is that "a supervisory conference should have a primary purpose [and] most of the conference time and communication should be directed to a primary objective." Third, Hunter recognizes that "the principles of learning that apply to students also apply to teachers," and fourth, that:

> Teaching is behavior and can best be improved through analysis of that behavior . . . . The teaching behaviors observed must then be interpreted and categorized as: a) those that prompted learning; b) those that used precious time and energy yet contributed nothing to learning; and c) those that unintentionally, actually interfered with learning

(Hunter, 1980:409).

Hunter (1980:409-412) discusses two broad categories of supervisory conferences based on the purposes and objectives of the conference: the instructional (formative) conference and the evaluative (summative) conference.

I. The Instructional Conferences

Specifically, Hunter identifies five types of instructional conferences. The typologies, their purposes and some examples are summarized as follows:

Type A Conference. The supervisor focusses only on those aspects of instruction that were effective and brings those decisions and behaviors to the conscious awareness of the student teacher who then has an opportunity to learn reasons for their effectiveness, and as a result use them deliberately and appropriately in the future. The following is an example of a Type A Conference:

SUPERVISOR: "Your moving over and standing by John's desk when he was not listening was an excellent technique. Everyone is more obedient when the authority is close. That's what happens to all of us when we see the police car in the rearview mirror. Then, your using John's name in an example about his being a good ball player not only built his self-concept and caused him to listen, but paired his interest in athletics with your lesson . . . . You used three excellent instructional techniques: physical closeness, use of the student's name in a meaningful example, and pairing the student's interest with academic content."

Type B Conference. The student teacher and the supervisor together generate alternatives to behaviors which were effective in the observed lesson in case they should be less effective in a different situation. Student teachers can become set in their patterns of presentation, discipline, homework, or practice, thereby reducing flexibility in their teaching. Type B conferences are designed to break this encapsulation and create new options. An example of a Type B Conference would be:

SUPERVISOR: "Standing by John's desk and using his name in a complimentary example was very effective. With most students that will work. What might you (the student teacher) do if it didn't?"

Type C Conference. The student teacher is encouraged and given first opportunity to identify those parts of a teaching episode with which they were not satisfied so that, in collaboration with the supervisor, strategies for reducing or eliminating future unsatisfactory outcomes will be developed.

Although the student teacher is given the first opportunity to suggest solutions, it is also the obligation of the supervisor to pose possible solutions, or to acknowledge that he cannot think of any. Instructional conferencing is not a spectator sport. The following example illustrates a Type C Conference:

STUDENT TEACHER: "I assumed the students would have remembered the material. I was disappointed to see how much of it they had forgotten."

SUPERVISOR: "It's not unusual that we assume students remember and they don't. What might be done to eliminate the situation?"

SUPERVISOR: "Sometimes a quick check to see if students remember the process needed will not only help them recall it, but will alert you if they don't. You might do one example together on the chalkboard. That can serve as a warm-up and a reminder before you move on to new material. If they've forgotten, you can reteach right then when it's needed."

Type D Conference. The supervisor identifies and labels those less effective aspects of teaching. i.e., "What went wrong?" and which may or may not have been evident to the teacher. The student teacher then selects alternative behavior he/she might substitute for them, for example:

SUPERVISOR: "Did you realize that you used an 'o' instead of an 'u' when you spelled out the word 'Garneau' on the board?"

STUDENT TEACHER: "Oh no, perhaps I should have asked one of the students to spell each letter out loudly as I wrote it . . ."

Type E Conference. Type E (for excellent) conference is designed to promote growth beyond that which the teacher alone can generate. The supervisor contributes and promotes continuing growth of an excellent teacher. The teacher then selects next steps for expanding his own professional growth. An example of this type of conference would be:

SUPERVISOR: "That was a superb lesson. Would you be willing to put a similar lesson on videotape so we can use it to help new teachers?"

SUPERVISOR: "Your ability to draw out shy students is remarkable. Will you go over your lesson with me to help me understand the cues that tell you when to push students and when to back off?"

SUPERVISOR: "You have the skills to pilot this new program so we can identify strengths and weaknesses before we consider its adoption for the whole school."

SUPERVISOR: "Your skills are such that others should be learning from you. Would you be willing to take a student teacher? . . . the student teacher will have the advantage of not only learning about effective teaching but seeing it modeled daily."

II. The Evaluative Conferences

Hunter (1980:412) defines an evaluative conference as:

> . . . the summation of what has occurred in and resulted from a series of instructional conferences. . . . the culmination of a year's (or required period) diagnostic, prescriptive, collaborative

> work with a teacher and a supervisor who shared responsibility for the teacher's continuous (formative) professional growth.

Implied in this definition is that information given and conclusions reached in an evaluative conference should come as no surprise to the teacher because the supporting evidence would have been discussed in the previous formative instructional conferences. As a result, the summative evaluative conference should have high probability of being perceived as fair, just and supportable by objective evidence rather than based on subjective opinion. Although not explicityly stated, a climate of mutual trust is assumed between the supervisor and student teacher.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO MODES OF FEEDBACK OR SPECIFIC SUPERVISORY TECHNIQUES

It has been generally accepted that feedback from supervisors to student teachers is desirable in the process of teacher training. There is considerable disagreement, however, as to how much should be given and how it should be dispensed. This section addresses the latter of the two problems.

Experimental studies of specific supervisory techniques are currently having considerable impact on supervisory practice. These studies are attempts to develop systematic methods of describing and analyzing teaching by the use of information feedback, a concept derived from engineering and the physical sciences.

Research on supervision has made feedback on teaching performance available to teachers by employing time-lapse photography (MacGraw, 1965), kinescopes (Schueler and Gold 1964), electrical signals indicating student understanding (Belanger, 1962), pupil opinions (Seager, 1965), and a number of instruments for categorizing teaching (see, for example, Ishler (1965), Yulo (1967), Brown, Cobban and Waterman (1966), Morrison and Dixon (1964). The volume of published or proposed studies of this type is substantial.

An elaborate research carried out by Joyce (1967) sought to examine how college instructors, cooperating teachers and student teachers behaved when integrated feedback systems were introduced into the teacher education program.

An integrated feedback system designed to enable student teachers to analyze their teaching, set goals for improvement, and monitor their own progress was instituted in the Teachers College, Columbia University. Elements of the feedback system included the use of a system for behavioral analysis of teaching and the use of films and audio and television tapes of teaching by the student teachers. Faculty behavior as well as feedback roles of students and cooperating teachers were analyzed. The procedure for Joyce's study was as follows:

1. All students were to learn a system for the behavioral analysis of teaching.

2. All students were to make a weekly tape recording of a lesson they taught, were expected to analyze the lesson and to be prepared to use it in conferences and seminars with their supervisors.

3. Students, in consultation with supervisors, were to schedule filming and videotaping of their teaching.

4. Supervisors and students were to have weekly conferences in which supervisors were to assist students to analyze their teaching and learn to judge their progress, using the behavioral analysis technique.

5. In weekly seminars, supervisors would help groups of students analyze teaching and set group and individual goals for the expansion of their repertoire of teaching maneuvers and to develop strategies for coping with common problems in teaching.

The central question that guided the design of the study was:

> When television, tape, filming, and the analysis of teaching are introduced into the student teaching program (in an integrated feedback system), what changes should be made in the utilization of supervisors of student teaching? (Joyce, 1967:12).

The strategy of the study was developed around four specific questions:

1. How much large group instruction in the analysis of teaching is required before trainees employ the system of analysis in the analysis of their own teaching? To answer the question, the content of conferences between students and supervisors were analyzed to determine the stages at

which the systems began to be used and the kinds of use to which they were put.

2. "Can teacher trainees, independent of faculty, carry on the feedback and analysis session?" This question was explored by instituting student leadership for seminars and comparing the content of these seminars with faculty led seminars.

3. To what extent can cooperating teachers from the public schools substitute for college faculty in providing feedback to student teachers? The general method for exploring the question was to involve several cooperating teachers from the public schools in the seminars, where they substituted for college faculty several times. The content of the cooperating teacher led seminars was compared with the content of the faculty led seminars.

4. How much "live" classroom visitation of student teachers is required in addition to the analysis and feedback sessions (conferences and seminars) around which supervision was organized? The general method for this question was to vary amounts of live supervision and examine the effects on the content of conferences, on the student-initiated demand for supervision, and on student and faculty judgment about the adequacy of supervision for each student.

The general conclusions with regard to staff utilization suggest that supervisors need extensive training for feedback roles; that student teachers and cooperating teachers could lead feedback sessions without negative effects on the content; that the use of a feedback system can begin early in the teacher training program if it is carefully monitored; and that there is a tendency for students, cooperating teachers and supervisors to discuss hypothetical situations rather than the filmed or taped teaching episodes. Analysis of the findings of this research program have lead to recommendations that (1) integrated feedback systems should include prominent feedback roles for students and cooperating teachers, and (2) that expectations and roles of faculty members, cooperating teachers, and students should be carefully defined.

Those concerned with microteaching have experimented with a number of feedback modes. There has been live lesson supervision, where the supervisor observes the lesson and then gives the trainee feedback. Students have been asked to fill out questionnaires at the conclusion of a lesson for the benefit of the trainee who taught them. Video and audio recording units have been used for self-supervision and they have also been used in conjunction with supervisor feedback. Other combinations have been used with varying degrees of effectiveness. Videotaping has been useful in both developing and displaying models of the various teaching skills.

Main (1972), for example, conducted a study the purpose of which was to investigate the relative effectiveness of three modes of giving feedback to trainees on acquisition of a single teaching skill in a microteaching situation. A second purpose of Main's study was to determine which of the three modes of feedback the trainees preferred and what it was about that particular mode they valued. The feedback modes studied were: a) peer group plus supervisor; b) peer group only; c) supervisor only. The dependent variable was the teaching skill of asking probing questions. More specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What effect will each of the three modes of giving feedback have on the number of probing questions trainees asked in a five minute microteaching lesson?

2. What effect will each of the three modes of giving feedback have on the variety of probing questions trainees asked in a five minute microteaching lesson?

3. What modes of receiving feedback in a microteaching situation will the trainees prefer?

4. What factors of the three modes of feedback do the trainees value?

The samples used in Main's study consisted of twenty-two randomly selected students enrolled in the microteaching course at the University of Manitoba during the summer of 1971.

At the conclusion of the study, post-test lessons were recorded and compared to the pretest lessons. An attitude survey was also completed by each trainee to determine which type of feedback was valued most. The survey was designed to indicate the reasons for any positive attitude that existed. The Attitude Survey was divided into three factors that would have contributed to positive attitude as follows: A) Perceived increase in skill; B) Acquisition of valued knowledge; and C) Increase in self-confidence. Differences between groups on these factors were described in terms of average group scores on the items in each factor.

The findings of the study were as follows: supervisor feedback was most effective in increasing the variety of probing questions; supervisor plus peer group feedback was effective in producing a shift from category five (redirect) to category one (clarification), but there was very little increase in variety; peer group feedback was least effective in producing a shift toward a greater variety of probes; trainees who received supervisor feedback only scored highest in positive attitude. Peer group feedback trainees scored lowest, but the group that had peer group plus supervisor feedback was only slightly more positive.

Trainees who received supervisor feedback alone scored higher than the other groups on all factors except the one dealing with social satisfaction. Even on this factor, however, their score was quite high. Implications of these findings are that effective supervisory feedback is essential in eliciting desirable changes in student teachers' performance. The same implications have been echoed in Joyce's findings cited earlier, which emphasize among other things, the necessity for extensive training of supervisors (both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers) for feedback roles.

In fact, the two studies, Joyce's (1967) and Main's (1972) have relevance to this study to the extent that modified forms of the instruments used in the two studies have been adapted for use in the present study (see Appendix C).

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF RELATED LITERATURE TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEMS

A review of related literature has been presented in this chapter under four major topic areas. First, the review of the literature has been focussed around the principles of effective supervisory feedback. Fifteen propositions for effective feedback were derived from the review and the items compiled in the Feedback Analysis Form. (Appendix A). The second part of the review of the literature was concentrated on the topic areas of supervisory feedback. Ten components of effective teaching have been generated for inclusion in the Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B). The various typologies of supervisory conferences have been explored in the third section of the chapter.

Indirect supervisory practices have been found to elicit more favourable attitudes towards supervision. Instructional supervisory conferences and conferences that have focussed on specific but fewer themes based on the three principles of fewness, saliency and manageability have also appeared to offer more satisfactory results in terms of changing or improving the student teachers' performance in subsequent teaching. In the fourth part of the review of the literature, specific modes of feedback have been outlined. The advantages of studying what actually happens in the classroom are obvious. Precise, accurate description of teaching performance is made possible, as are the development and testing of hypotheses about the process itself. It is also prevalent from the review in this section that no observational or technological system of feedback can by itself substitute or compensate for sloppy supervisory practices. The importance of good training of supervisors for their roles cannot be overemphasized.

Generally, however, it would seem that for supervisory feedback to be successful, however, it should be presented in a situation where the subject: a) feels basically secure; b) is not threatened more than he can handle; c) can trust the supervisor; d) feels that the other understands and has positive regard for him. These four principles of effective feedback apply to any feedback situation and tend to comply with one or the other of the 15 principles of effective supervisory feedback discussed in the earlier section of this chapter.

Another general point about supervisory feedback that emerges from the review of the literature in Chapter 2 is that feedback makes it possible for supervisors to provide the student teacher with selected or exhaustive information about his/her teaching. Such information is no more useful or effective, however, than the effort supervisors and student teachers put into dispensing it. If their analyses and applications to teaching, are specific, comprehensive, supportive, and interactive, the probability of such information making a difference in subsequent teaching seems to increase. The essence of effective supervisory feedback lies in the student teachers' perception of such effectiveness in terms of their satisfaction with the process and substance of supervisory feedback in post-observation conference sessions. Such is the purpose, hence focus, of this study, the design of which is discussed in the next chapter in relation to the three clusters of variables outlined above: namely, the effectiveness of supervisory practices in feedback sessions; the substance (topic areas) of supervisory feedback; and, the satisfaction of student teachers with the process and substance of supervisory feedback.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The instrumentation and methodology used to address the research questions are outlined in this chapter as follows:

First, the sample is described and the generalizability of any conclusions reached by the researcher assessed. Second, the construction, validation, and revisions of the three instruments used to obtain data are detailed. A pilot study and a training session that were organized to field test two of the instruments are also described under the relevant research instruments in this section. Third, the time line for data collection is presented and, fourth, the treatment of the data is described.

THE SAMPLE

Three groups of respondents were used as samples in the study as described below.

The Student Teachers

The first sample consisted of 25 student teachers who were enrolled in the Plan B program at the University of Alberta. The student teachers were in their fourth and last year of a Bachelor of Education degree program which was preparing them to teach in elementary schools. There were 23 females and 2 males comprising the sample of student teachers.

The organization of the Plan B program was somewhat different from the other teacher education programs offered at the University of Alberta. Students opting for the Plan B program registered for a professional year of studies involving 10 to 11 weeks of practicum experience integrated with their studies of education at the University. A limited number of Elementary Route majors enrolled in Plan B in the fourth year of their program. The distinctive features of the program centred around a field experience core in the fourth year and the team approach taken with regard to Curriculum and Instruction, Basic Education and the Practicum components. Students remained in one group for all activities except student teaching. Each student teacher was assigned to various classroom experiences in the same school throughout the academic year. Further information regarding the Plan B practicum program is provided in Appendix D.

Dates of the in-school student teaching were arranged by the course coordinator with the schools involved as follows:

Round 1: October 20 - November 7, 1980.
Round 2: February 23 - March 27, 1981.

Term 1 was used for initial familiarization contacts, pilot testing and the revalidation of the instruments. Data collection was done in Term 2.

The five cooperating schools where the 25 student teachers were placed for the period of student teaching were included in the study. Of the five schools, four were administered by the Edmonton Public School Board and one by the Edmonton Separate (Catholic) School Board. All the five schools were elementary schools.

The Cooperating Teachers

The second sample comprised all the 25 cooperating teachers who were assigned by the cooperating school principals to supervise the student teachers. Twenty-two of the cooperating teachers were female and three were male. One of the three male cooperating teachers was also the principal of the particular cooperating school and another one of the three male cooperating teachers was the vice-principal of another cooperating school. All the cooperating teachers had considerable experience in the supervision of student teachers and were held in high regard by their principals for their teaching abilities and human relations practices.

The Faculty Consultants

The third sample comprised the four faculty consultants who were members of the Plan B supervisory team as well as instructors in various departments at the University of Alberta.

The departments represented by the four faculty consultants were: Educational Administration; Educational

Psychology; Educational Foundations; and Elementary Education. All four faculty consultants were male. The student teachers were all taking courses from the four faculty consultants as part of the Plan B program.

In summary, then, the sample consisted of student teachers (n = 25); cooperating teachers (n = 25); and faculty consultants (n = 4).

Initial Contact with the Sample

Permission to undertake the research study was requested from the Edmonton Public and Catholic school systems as a University of Alberta Research Request through the Division of Field Services, Faculty of Education, the University of Alberta. The request document, filed on the 8th day of September, 1980, is included in Appendix E.

Formal approval to conduct the research in the schools was received two weeks after filing the official requests. The letters of approval from the two school boards and the conditions of approval are also included in Appendix E.

The letter of approval from the Edmonton Public School Board advised the researcher to contact the school principals directly to obtain their approval to visit their schools and to make the necessary arrangements for conducting the study. The initial contacts with principals were made by phone and appointments to visit the schools scheduled.

The Edmonton Catholic School District made the initial contact with the principal of the one school in their district that was included in the study. Upon their advice, the principal then consulted the researcher by phone and made necessary arrangements for the researcher's first visit to the school.

The cooperating teachers were forewarned by the principals that a research project had received formal approval and that the researcher would be visiting the schools prior to the study to explain, clarify and outline her intentions.

The researcher was introduced to the student teachers by the researcher's supervisor who was a member of the Plan B teaching team. The arrangement for the initial contact with faculty consultants was also made through the researcher's supervisor. The theme for all the initial contacts was to request the cooperation of the respondents and to make explicit the researcher's intentions. The details for such contacts are outlined in Appendix F.

Although there were benefits gained by selecting the study participants in this way, particularly with respect to ease of communication and establishing the necessary relationships, there was also an acute lack of randomness in the selection procedure. The three groups of respondents included in the study sample only represented the particular practicum program, the particular elementary schools and the particular supervisory team. This phenomenon reflects on the generalizations that the researcher can make based on the analysis of data. It may be that the findings are applicable only to the particular groups of respondents from whom information was collected. Any further generalizations should be made with extreme caution.

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

In order to address the purposes of this study, it was necessary to construct or adapt the instruments which were used; suitable standardized instruments developed by earlier researchers were simply not available. The three areas of supervision about which information was to be sought were the effectiveness of supervisory feedback processes as perceived by the student teachers; the substance (topic areas) of supervisory feedback as recorded by the researcher; and the student teachers' satisfaction with the supervisory practices during post-observation conference sessions. Consequently, three research instruments were developed/adapted for the study. A detailed description of the instruments and related research questions is presented below.

Research Instrument Related to Effectiveness of Supervisory Processes

The source of data concerning the effectiveness of supervisory feedback processes during post-observation conference sessions was the Feedback Analysis Form (Appendix A).

Construction of the Feedback Analysis Form. The Feedback Analysis Form (FAF) was adapted from Hyman's (1975:150) original Feedback Analysis Form. The items included in the FAF were backed by an extensive review of literature presented in the second section of Chapter 2. Hyman's original Feedback Analysis Form is included with that adapted for the study in Appendix A.

Modification of the Feedback Analysis Form. The review of the literature, however, emphasized two other principles of effective feedback which were not made explicit on Hyman's original FAF. These two principles were labelled in the literature as support-inducing communications behavior (Blumberg, 1974:92-94) and provision for individual privacy during supervisory feedback sessions (Education Practicum Handbook, 1979-80:51). Inspection of Hyman's original FAF and the FAF adapted for the study suggests that the two items were added as items 1 (supportive-nonsupportive) and 15 (privacy ensured . . . privacy not ensured) on the FAF used in the study. In addition the interviews conducted and field notes made during the first round of student teaching while the instruments were being refined, established that the student teachers felt "threatened" at times, especially when provided with negative feedback. They also felt uncomfortable when feedback sessions were held in places where there were other teachers or student teachers; for example, the staffroom. Inclusion of these two additional items was therefore justified and necessary for purposes of the study (See chart in Appendix A for the specific item modifications).

The Training Session with the Student Teachers. In the second week of February, 1981, about one week prior to the commencement of the second round of student teaching, a training session was arranged by the researcher and facilitated by the researcher's supervisor, to acquaint the student teachers with the instrument, the items, and the procedures for the completion of the FAF. The package for the training session is included in Appendix G. During the session, the researcher provided each student teacher with the package which included several articles among which was an analysis of each of the 15 items stated in question form as shown on the Appendix. The researcher explained to the student teachers that the 15 questions were actually the 15 items on the FAF. Expressing them in question form was only meant to generate the student teachers awareness of what they would be expected to look for in the actual feedback sessions during the second round of student teaching. The questions were also a good way of probing the student teachers' understanding of the items. The researcher read out each question and cited each example given below each question. The student teachers were then asked for questions following the citation of each section. The researcher took notes of any concerns, misunderstandings, and redundancy. The researcher then requested the student teachers to write, on the spaces provided below each question, any examplary statements of supervisory ~~practices~~ which could be included in the particular item. The student teachers then reported back the examples they had written for each item. This procedure was long and tedious but very beneficial to the student teachers. By the end of the training session some general consensus was apparent that the exercise had provided each student teacher with a "standard measure" for each of the 15 items. No revisions to the FAF were found to be necessary as a result of this exercise. The content of the items was found to be clear to the student teachers.

There were other articles contained in the package for the training session. One was the "actual" FAF to be used in the study. The purpose of this was to explain how the FAF was to be completed, the meaning of the scale and that two copies of it were expected by the researcher from each student teacher every week. Again the student teachers were encouraged to ask any questions or express any concerns regarding the researcher's expectations. No concerns were expressed. The other article in the package was the time schedule for the researchers' visits to each school and the activities the researcher hoped to be involved in for each visit. The student teachers were encouraged to suggest changes and raise concerns. One change that was unanimously suggested was that the researcher would not visit the schools during the first week of student teaching since it would be a traumatic week for the student teachers coping with several adjustments. Furthermore, very few, if any, of the student teachers would be teaching the classes that early in the five-week period of student teaching. Although the researcher would have desired to find out the nature of supervisory feedback, if any, during this very important phase of adjustment, a further consideration of an approaching Teachers' Convention during the same week nullified any attempts at data collection that week. Data collection was therefore started the week beginning March, 2, 1981. The last article appended in the training session package was the Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B). This was done so that the student teachers would be aware of what the researcher would be doing in the post-observation conference sessions. The researcher had in the earlier visits in the first round of student teaching anticipated the student teachers' "fears" of being evaluated by the researcher during the sessions. Elimination or reduction of this fear was therefore necessary. The researcher, however, cautioned the student teachers not to show the Post-Observation Conference Checklist to their supervisors so as not to introduce bias to the session through pre-planned arrangements of how to conduct the sessions to suit the researcher. The supervisors had been made reasonably aware, by word-of-mouth explanation, of what the researcher would be doing in the feedback sessions.

Finally, the student teachers were very briefly reminded that they would be expected to fill in one questionnaire each during the last week of student teaching or immediately after. No more discussions were encouraged about the questionnaire except that anonymity would be guaranteed.

The researcher ended the training session by thanking the student teachers in advance for their cooperation and making out a list of the student teachers' names, addresses and phone numbers for further consultations during the student teaching period. No member of the supervisory team attended the training session. The atmosphere during the entire session was felt by the researcher and most of the student teachers with whom discussions were held following the session, as "pleasant""and "very educative". It was however, sensed by the researcher that one or two students may have shown an attitude (non-verbal) of too much being asked of them by the researcher in addition to the regular load of student teaching.

The Feedback Analysis Form was designed to elicit responses pertaining to the first research question: "To what extent did the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers approach optimal effectiveness according to the 15 propositions of effective feedback derived from the literature review as perceived by the student teachers?"

Research Instrument Related to the Topic Areas (substance) of Supervisory Feedback

The Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B) was the source of data concerning the substance of supervisory feedback.

Construction of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist. The Post-Observation Conference Checklist was developed by the researcher based on classification systems espoused by other writers. The ten categories or topic areas included in the Post-Observation Conference Checklist were derived from a literature review of the various frameworks for classifying or identifying topics of conversation about teaching. The generation of the categories from relevant studies and other frameworks was discussed fully in the review of the literature (Chapter 2). Generally, the ten categories identified for inclusion on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist were consistent with those listed in other sources cited in the review of the literature.

Validation and Revision of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist. Validity of the instrument was ensured by the agreement among the various frameworks as the major components of teaching competency. The format for the instrument, however, required remodelling to address the purpose of the research question pertaining to the substance of supervisory feedback. The reaction of the members of the researcher's supervisory committee on the various initial formats of the instrument contributed substantially to the final format used in the study. It was, however, essential that the researcher test the instrument in a situation as close to the real data gathering setting as possible. The principles of simplicity and accuracy of the format guided the adjustments and modifications that were made. The use of research assistants was not feasible given time and financial constraints. It was therefore important that the researcher devise a format that was very simple to use so as to get as much data recorded as possible on the one hand, and on the other hand, record the data as accurately as possible. A second consideration had to do with the sensitive nature of data collection. The researcher had to be unobtrusive during the feedback session, i.e. to be physically present during the entire period of the conference and yet not distract the participants. The two areas of concern raised above justified elimination of too much writing which might distract some participants. A checklist format and a 30-second interval for checking the categories were consequently adapted in the final format.

The Post-Observation Conference Checklist was field tested by using a random sample of the sessions taped during the first round of student teaching. A mini-analysis of the data suggested the feasibility of the format. A close scrutiny of the data by the supervisory committee led to a final acceptance of the format. It was, however, agreed that the researcher should supplement the list of categories with exemplary topic areas for each category as a source of reference during data collection. Such a list is included in the Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B).

The research question that the analysis of data gathered by means of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist sought to answer was: "What was the substance (topic areas) of supervisory feedback during the student teaching period as recorded by the researcher, in relation to the six sub-problems listed under this research question in Chapter 1?"

Research Instrument Related to Student Teachers' Satisfaction with Supervisory Feedback

A survey research methodology was used to collect data for purposes of assessing the satisfaction of student teachers with the supervisory feedback they received. A questionnaire approach was chosen as the instrument for data collection since, as Kerlinger (1973:422) has observed "survey research is probably best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes." Sellitz et al. (1966) have also observed that in questionnaires, respondents often feel freer to express views of which others might disapprove or which might cause them trouble.

The questionnaire technique has been reported by Bohrnstedt (1967) to be equal in reliability to the interview technique in eliciting job attitudes. The Satisfaction Questionnaire, a copy of which is included in Appendix C, was developed as a basis for providing data related to the satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory feedback during the student teaching period (Research Question 3).

Construction of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of two main parts. Part A of the questionnaire was designed to include 28 items pertaining to supervisory practices used in post-observation conference sessions. The items sought the views of the student teachers regarding their satisfaction with the practices included in the 28 items. The 28 items were adapted from an attitude survey which had been used as a basis for data collection in a previous study (Main, 1972:102-105). The purposes of the Satisfaction Questionnaire and the description of the items in relation to the research question for which the survey was used are dealt with more fully in the review of the literature (Chapter 2) and in an attachment in Appendix C.

A five-point Likert-type scale which ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5) was used to rate the degree of satisfaction of the student teachers with the supervisory practices. After the 28 items were factor analyzed, the scores on the items were expressed in terms of Satisfaction Scores. The details of the factor analysis are provided in Chapter 7 in the discussion of analysis of the data related to research question 3.

Part B of the questionnaire was designed to elicit responses pertaining to the student teacher's satisfaction with the adequacy of supervisory feedback with regards to selected teaching practices (item 29) and selected settings or locations in which feedback sessions were held (items 32 and 33). Four open-ended or semi-structured items (30, 31, 34 and 35) were designed to probe into possible areas relevant to the research problems which might not have been included in any of the items in the first two sections of the questionnaire.

The ten items included in question 29 were directly taken from those used by Joyce (1967:23-25). Modifications were made in the wording of the items and the format of scaling to suit the purposes of the study. A more detailed description of Joyce's study is included in the review of the literature (Chapter 2). Joyce's instruments are included in Appendix C.

Items included in questions 32 and 33 were based on observations the researcher made during the first round of student teaching of the various place settings various supervisors used for their feedback sessions and the reactions of the student teachers to those settings.

Reliability of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. The reliability of an instrument is concerned with the consistency of the data produced by repeated applications of the instrument. Hill and Kerber (1967:64) stated that:

> The reliability of the questionnaire depends upon the length of the instrument, the subject, the wording of items, the format, and how the instrument motivates the respondent. Pilot studies, trial runs, and

> precautionary methods of construction based upon factors affecting questionnaire reliability are courses of action available to the researcher who wishes to construct a reliable questionnaire.

Time and other constraints did not permit repeated applications of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. It was hoped, however, that a certain measure of reliability had been established given that most of the items included in the instrument were derived from instruments used in other successful studies (Joyce, 1967; Main, 1972).

A pilot study that is described more fully under the content validity of the questionnaire also added, to some extent, to the consistency of the items included in this instrument.

Validity of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. The "validity of a data-gathering instrument depends upon how effectively the instrument measures what it purports to measure" (Hill and Kerber, 1967:65).

Establishment of two types of validity are essential in non-standardized instruments like the questionnaire used in the study. These are content validity or the representativeness of the contents of the instrument and construct validity or the internal consistency of the measures or value applied to the variables.

Content Validity. The representativeness of the content of the questionnaire for supervisory processes was appraised by graduate students who were the researcher's peers; faculty members who were part of the researcher's supervisory committee and by the student teachers who took part in the pilot study. Judgements, opinions, and suggestions for improvement were taken into account in the revision of the questionnaire.

A pilot study was also conducted as part of the process to ensure the validity of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. The researcher administered the questionnaire to ten undergraduate students enrolled in Educational Administration 401 who were not included in the study sample. All ten students had had some experience of student teaching prior to the pilot study. That the reactions of some student teachers were sought in order to gain item specificity and comprehensiveness was justified in terms of Bouchard's (1976:380) suggestion that:

> the most efficient and most productive way to formulate effective questions, as well as set a positive framework for the research, is to involve at least some of the respondents in the construction of the questionnaire.

The students' written comments included their reactions to the content, the length, the wording of the items and the appropriateness of the scaling system.

A trial data analysis was run and the results scrutinized for the second time by the researcher and the supervisory committee. Such analysis resulted in relevant amendments, including elimination of several items that were redundant, vague or ambiguous.

Construct Validity. The use of internal consistency measures is one method of checking construct validity (Guilford and Frutcher, 1973). With respect to such measures of internal consistency, Kerlinger, (1973:468) claims that "factor analysis is perhaps the most powerful method of construct validation." The results of the factor analysis performed on the 28 items on Part A of the questionnaire are reported in Chapter 7.

TIME LINE FOR DATA COLLECTION

As mentioned in Chapter 3, dates for the in-school student teaching were arranged by the course coordinator with the cooperating schools. Round 1 of student teaching was in the Fall of 1980 and round 2 in the Winter of 1981.

The sequence for data collection was therefore as follows:

Round 1: October 20 - February 7 (Fall), 1980.
Building relationships; construction of instruments; participant observation and interviews; pilot testing; validation of instruments.

Round 2: February 23 - March 27 (Winter), 1981.
(February 23 - February 27 - NO DATA COLLECTION)
March 3 - March 21
Feedback Analysis Form
Post-Observation Conference Checklist

March 23 - March 27

Satisfaction Questionnaire

The first week of the second round of student teaching was left open since a Teachers' Convention planned for the latter part of that week interrupted the student teaching. Data collection was therefore started on the second week of student teaching which is referred to as the first week in the data analysis chapters.

A time line for the study is provided in Table 2.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

All statistical analyses were done utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version H. The analyses were run on the MTS Computer available through the Department of Computing Services, The University of Alberta.

The analysis of the basic research data consisted of the following:

1. Responses of student teachers to items on the Feedback Analysis Form
   a) Analysis of the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers in terms of the 15 propositions of effective feedback.
   b) The extent to which the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers changed over the four weeks of student teaching as indicated

TABLE 2

Time Line For the Study

Spring-Summer, 1980	Fall, 1980	Winter, 1980-81	Spring, 1981 Onwards
Proposal Development	Candidacy (Oct. 2)	Training Session	Follow-Up
Literature Review	Familiarization	Data Collection	Data Analysis
	Pilot Testing	Observation	Dissertation Writing
	Interviews	Questionnaire Surveys (February 23 - March 27)	
	Revalidation of the Instruments (October 20 - November 7)		

by changes in their mean scores.

c) The extent to which the mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers differed within the schools.

d) The extent to which the mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers differed between schools.

2. Responses pertaining to the substance of supervisory feedback as recorded by the researcher on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist

a) Specific topics discussed during post-observation conference sessions.

b) Frequency of occurrence of the topics.

c) Amount of time spent on each topic.

d) Pattern of initiation of the topics by the faculty consultants, the cooperating teachers and the student teachers.

e) The general order of occurrence of the topics.

f) Average number of topics that occurred per session.

3. Responses of student teachers to items on the Satisfaction Questionnaire

a) Reports by student teachers of their satisfaction with supervisory feedback during the student teaching period.

b) Relationship between the satisfaction of student teachers and the effectiveness of supervisory feedback (relating 1 and 3 above).

c) Relationship between substance of feedback (2 above), overall supervisory effectiveness (1 above) and satisfaction of student teachers.

The statistical techniques used to analyze the data included a comparison of mean scores, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)in combination with F-Tests and t-Tests, Frequency and Percentage Distributions, Factor Analysis and Satisfaction Scores, Content Analysis, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients, and Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis. Each of these techniques is described more fully as follows:

1. Comparison of Mean Scores

A gross comparison of mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers, was done based on the student teachers' responses to the 15 items on the Feedback Analysis Form. Such a comparison led to a statement of the relationship between the faculty consultants' and cooperating teachers' supervisory practices and the 15 propositions of effective feedback derived from the literature review. The details of the comparison are outlined in Chapter 5 under the analysis of data related to research question 1. Comparison of Mean Scores was also done to address research questions 4 and 5.

2. t-Tests (F-Tests)

One-Way Analysis of Variance and t-tests were used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the two groups; faculty consultants and cooperating teachers, on overall supervisory effectiveness (Sub-problems 1:2 and 1:3).

F-tests were used in the analysis of data that required tests of significance to be made between more than two groups, for example, significance of the changes in mean scores over the four weeks of student teaching (sub-problem 1:1), significance of the differences in overall satisfaction scores among the five schools (research question 3), and significance of the changes in satisfaction scores over the four weeks of student teaching (also under research question 3).

A minimum significance level of .05 was established for the various t-test analyses. When the One-Way Analysis of Variance provided an F which was statistically significant beyond .05 level, the Scheffé procedure (Winer, 1971) was used to compare individual groups in an attempt to locate the differences which contributed to the ANOVA results. Because of the conservative (Hill and Kerber, 1967:372) and rigorous nature of the Scheffé procedure, the significance level was set at .10 (Ferguson: 1971:271) for the results of the F-tests. Tests for ANOVA are usually accompanied by tests for homogeneity of variance. Ferguson (1971:219) reports that -- F = t even when two groups are of unequal size. In the study for example, the number of faculty consultants (n = 4) was much smaller than that of cooperating teachers (n = 23). This explains why in this study, actual numbers in each group are reported rather than degrees of freedom, since the numbers provide useful detail. There is, however, general agreement that the F-Test is fairly robust and can accommodate departures from homogeneity (Ferguson, 1971:219-220; Kerlinger, 1973:287-8; Winer, 1971:206).

Two assumptions, other than homogeneity of variance, underly the use of F-tests. Firstly, reasonable departures from the assumption that there is normality of distribution of dependent variables in the population from which the sample was drawn, are thought not to affect the validity of inferences drawn from the data. Secondly, the assumption that the effects of various factors on the total variation are additive is valid in most situations (Ferguson, 1971:219).

3. Frequency and Percentage Distributions

Frequency and percentage distributions were computed for each of the ten categories on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist. Information gathered from the analysis of these data was used in the discussion of the six sub-problems of question 2 and research question 5.

4. Factor Analysis and Satisfaction Scores

A Factor Analysis was undertaken for the pool of 28 items contained in Part A of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. According to Kerlinger (1973:659) "Factor Analysis is a method for determining the number and nature of the underlying variables among larger numbers of measures." In other words, a Factor Analysis is a method of extracting common factor variances from sets of measures. For purposes of this study, a Factor Analysis was done on the student teachers' responses in order to establish fewer or more tangible areas of supervisory practices to be used in addressing the relevant research question. The details of the three factors generated as a result of the analysis are described under question 3 and relevant parts of research question 4.

Satisfaction Scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on the three factors were then computed to enable comparisons with individual variables outlined in the research questions and sub-problems above, and as a measure of overall satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory feedback during the entire student teaching period.

5. Content Analysis

Content Analysis was done mostly on the items on Part B of the questionnaire, which elicited open-ended responses. The units of content analysis were the statements provided by the respondents. Kerlinger (1973:528) suggests that one method for categorizing responses is according to theme. This was done by the researcher initially by perusing the data generated by the respondents and later seeking the scrutiny of colleagues and the supervisory committee of the resulting lists of items and the categorization of such items. To accommodate the diversity of responses, an "other" category was added both as Question 35 on the questionnaire and under category 10 of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist. The results of the Content Analysis formed the basis for discussing the second Part of Question 3.

6. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Cooefficients

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to determine the relationship between effectiveness of supervisory feedback and satisfaction of student teachers with selected supervisory practices (factor analyzed items). Results of such an analysis are reported in the discussion of research question 4.

7. Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

A Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis was applied to the three factors generated from the 28 items on Part A of the Satisfaction Questionnaire. This analysis was meant to determine which of the three factors (predictor variables) were associated with the greatest percentage of variance in overall supervisory effectiveness. The results of the Analysis are reported in the discussion of research question 4.

The strategies for addressing each of the five research questions are summarized in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6.

TABLE 3

9

Strategy for Question 1

Research Question	Method of Data Collection	Statistical Techniques	Respondent
1. To what extent did the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers approach optimal effectiveness according to the 15 propositions for effective feedback derived from the literature review?	FEEDBACK ANALYSIS FORM (APPENDIX A)	Comparison of Mean Effectiveness Scores on the items	STUDENT TEACHERS
1:1 To what extent were there differences in the effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers between schools?		Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) F-tests	
1:2 To what extent were there differences in the effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers over the four weeks of student teaching?		Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) t-tests	
1:3 To what extent were there differences between the effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers within schools?			

TABLE 4

Strategy for Question 2

Research Question	Method of Data Collection	Statistical Techniques	Respondent
2. What were the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions during the student teaching period in relation to the following sub-problems?	POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE CHECKLIST (APPENDIX B)	FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS	RESEARCHER CODED
2:1 How often did the topics occur?			
2:2 How many topics occurred per session?			
2:3 How much time was spent on each topic?			
2:4 What was the pattern of initiation of the topics?			
2:5 With what topics did the supervisory feedback sessions start out?			
2:6 What was the general sequence of occurrence of the topics?			
2:7 With what topics did the supervisory feedback sessions end?			

TABLE 5

Strategy for Question 3

Research Question	Method of Data Collection	Statistical Techniques	Respondent
3. To what extent did the student teachers express satisfaction with the supervisory practices in feedback sessions during the student teaching period?	THE SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (APPENDIX C)	Factor Analysis; Factor Scores; Content Analysis	STUDENT TEACHERS
3:1 To what extent were there differences in the satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory practices *between* schools?		t-tests	
3:2 To what extent were there differences in the satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory practices *within* schools?		F-tests	

TABLE 6

Strategy for Questions 4 and 5

Research Question	Method of Data Collection	Statistical Techniques	Respondent
4. Was there any relationship between rated effectiveness of supervisory practices and satisfaction of student teachers?	1. Feedback Analysis Form 2. Satisfaction Questionnaire	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis; Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient; t-tests; Mean Effectiveness Scores; Satisfaction Scores	Student Teachers
5. Were there any discernible differences in the topic areas of supervisory feedback sessions between the more effective and the less effective supervisors?	All the three instruments	Overall Effectiveness Scores, Frequency and Percentage Distributions	Responses combined for supervisors and student teachers

CHAPTER 4

THE DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Because of the varied and complicated nature of data gathering involved in this study, it is necessary to explain the distribution of the three research instruments in terms of the expected and the actual returns from the respondents.

For purposes of this study, the total number of returns expected for each of the three research instruments is referred to as the N whereas the number of respondents (student teachers) is denoted by the n. The data collection procedure is described in this chapter in terms of the n and the N for each of the three research instruments.

THE INTENDED RETURNS (IN)

The n for each school is presented in Table 7. In total there were 25 student teachers included in the study. The number of student teachers (n) in each school also determined the number of cooperating teachers in the school. Since each student teacher had one cooperating teacher assigned to him or her, the number of cooperating teachers corresponded with the number of student teachers as shown in Table 7, giving a total of 25 cooperating teachers.

The faculty consultants, however, were assigned one to each school with one exception: for Afton and Kensington

TABLE 7

The Number of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers in Each School

School	No. of Student Teachers	No. of Cooperating Teachers
Afton	2	2
Kensington	8	8
Malmo	4	4
Meadowlark	5	5
St. Boniface	6	6
Total	25	25

one faculty consultant supervised student teachers in both schools. There were therefore, 4 faculty consultants included in the study (Table 8).

The number of student teachers in each school (n) also determined the total number of returns (N) expected of the three instruments in terms of the following general formula:

$$n \times nf \times nw = N$$

Where,

n = number of student teachers in each school

nf = number of times _each_ student teacher was expected, upon request, to fill out the instrument

nw = number of weeks of student teaching

N = number of total returns expected from each school.

The Total N would therefore be the sum of all the Ns expected for all the instruments from all the schools.

The IN for the Feedback Analysis Form

Each student teacher in each school was requested to fill out two Feedback Analysis Forms _each week_, one for the faculty consultant and the other for the cooperating teacher. This was to be done for all the four weeks of the second round of student teaching. The expected N for the Feedback Analysis Form for each school, using the above formula, is presented in Table 9. The total N expected for the Feedback Analysis Form for the entire student teaching period

TABLE 8

Number of Faculty Consultants in Each School

School	No. of Faculty Consultants
Afton	1
Kensington	
Malmo	1
Meadowlark	1
St. Boniface	1
Total	4

TABLE 9

Intended Returns for the Feedback Analysis Form

School	Number of Student Teachers (n)	Number of Times to Fill Out FAF Per Week	Number of Weeks of Student Teaching	Total
Afton	2	2	4	16
Kensington	8	2	4	64
Malmo	4	2	4	32
Meadowlark	5	2	4	40
St. Boniface	6	2	4	48
Total	25	2	4	200

was 200 as shown in Table 9.

The IN for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist

The Post-Observation Conference Checklist was intended to be filled out by the researcher only twice, for the entire student teaching period, for each student teacher, once during the student teacher's session with the faculty consultant, and once in a session with the cooperating teacher. The total N expected for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist was therefore 50. The expected N for this instrument for each school and for the entire student teaching period is presented in Table 10.

The IN for the Satisfaction Questionnaire

Each of the 25 student teachers was requested to fill one Satisfaction Questionnaire during the last week of the student teaching period. The expected N for the questionnaire, as shown in Table 11, was therefore 25.

The Intended Total N (IN)

As shown on Table 12, a total of 275 returns were expected for the entire student teaching period. The relevant returns were expected to aid the researcher in answering the research questions posed by this study. The research questions and the actual returns of the research instruments are discussed in the next three sections of this chapter. For purposes of clarity, a distinction is

TABLE 10

Intended Returns for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist

School	Number of Student Teachers	Number of Times the OCC Was Expected to be Filled Out For Each Student Teacher	Total
Afton	2	2	4
Kensington	8	2	16
Malmo	4	2	8
Meadowlark	5	2	10
St. Boniface	6	2	12
Total	25	2	50

TABLE 11

Intended Returns for the Satisfaction Questionnaire

School	Number of Student Teachers	Number of Times Each Student Teacher was Expected to Fill Out Questionnaire	Total
Afton	2	1	2
Kensington	8	1	8
Malmo	4	1	4
Meadowlark	5	1	5
St. Boniface	6	1	6
Total	25	1	25

TABLE 12

The Intended Total N (IN)

School	Research Instrument			
	Feedback Analysis Form	Observation Conference Checklist	Satisfaction Questionnaire	Total IN
Afton	16	4	2	22
Kensington	64	16	8	88
Malmo	32	8	4	44
Meadowlark	40	10	5	55
St. Boniface	48	12	6	66
Total	200	50	25	275

made between the expected or intended N (IN) and the actual returns (AN).

The Actual Returns (AN)

The actual returns (AN) are presented in the Tables which follow for each of the research instruments. The numbers in parenthesis () denote the intended returns (IN). A distinction has been made between the N for cooperating teachers and the N for faculty consultants to aid in the discussions which follow in this section. For the same purpose, the returns are considered for each week rather than for the entire student teaching period.

The AN for the Feedback Analysis Form

As stated earlier, the 25 student teachers were requested to fill out two forms each week, for the four weeks of student teaching. The actual returns for the instrument, presented in Table 13, suggest that 149 of the 200 intended returns (or 75%) were available for use in the data analysis. Although it was hoped that a 100% return be the basis for the analysis, certain factors militated against the realization of this intention.

The faculty consultant for Meadowlark school, for example, was not able to visit any of the student teachers during their first week of student teaching. Furthermore, the faculty consultants for Malmo and St. Boniface, given time constraints, were only able to observe some of the

TABLE 13

A Comparison of the Intended and the Actual Returns for the Feedback Analysis Form

Week		School					
		Afton	Kensington	Malmo	Meadowlark	St. Boniface	Total
1#	FC	2 (2)	8 (8) ((16))	3 (4)	0 (5)	2 (6)	15 (25) ((33))
	CT	2 (2)	5 (8)	4 (4)	5 (5)	5 (6)	21 (25)
2	FC	2 (2)	5 (8)	3 (4)	4 (5)	2 (6)	16 (25)
	CT	2 (2)	5 (8)	3 (4)	4 (5)	5 (6)	19 (25)
3	FC	2 (2)	5 (8)	4 (4)	5 (5)	1 (6)	17 (25)
	CT	2 (2)	5 (8)	4 (4)	5 (5)	4 (6)	20 (25)
4	FC	1 (2)	5 (8)	4 (4)	5 (5)	4 (6)	19 (25)
	CT	1 (2)	5 (8)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6,7* (6)	21,22* (25)
Total		14 (16)	43 (64) ((72))	29 (32)	33 (40)	29,30* (48)	149 (200) ((208))

The N in single parenthesis () denote intended returns (IN)

The N in double parenthesis (()) resulted from two faculty consultants being in one school during week 2.

*The student teacher was observed by two cooperating teachers in Week 4.

#Week 1 = 1st week of data collection (2nd week of student teaching) student teachers during the week in question and the remaining visits were scheduled for the following week. These two factors accounted, not only for the missing intended returns for week one, and in the schools mentioned above, but also for each of the four weeks of student teaching in each of the other schools. This factor was more prevalent for faculty consultants than it was for cooperating teachers. Another factor that affected the intended returns (IN) was that there were two faculty consultants in Kensington school in week 1. This meant that the expected N for this school in week one would not be (8) but ((16)) for the faculty consultants. The total IN would therefore be ((72)) instead of (64) (see Table 13).

The AN for cooperating teachers, was, however, affected mainly by the fact that for the first few weeks of student teaching it was difficult for cooperating teachers and student teachers to establish a consistent pattern of formal post-observation conferences. At the same time, most student teachers did not have the experience of teaching the classes alone until about the third week of their student teaching. At that time, the cooperating teachers would therefore be in a position to give feedback based on the student teachers' own teaching performance, rather than on their "assisting" role to the cooperating teachers.

Two major factors, therefore, affected the actual returns (AN) of the forms for cooperating teachers. On the one hand, some of the student teachers found it difficult to fill out the forms based on informal "hallway" chats which they described to the researcher as "not exactly feedback", and, on the other hand, some student teachers could not fill out the forms "just for the sake of having them ready for the researcher, and so, pleasing her" if they had not had a real classroom teaching experience that week.

One other isolated factor that affected the actual returns (AN) in St. Boniface School was that a student teacher was observed by two cooperating teachers in week 4. The resulting N is marked with an asterisk (*) on Table 13.

A few students, being human, just "forgot" to fill out these forms. An interesting observation which emerges on close examination of the Total N, however, is that it is the same student teachers who "forgot" to fill out the FAFs that also found it "very difficult" to arrange convenient times for feedback sessions with their supervisors in order for the researcher to code the Post-Observation Conference Checklist, and who also finally "forgot" to fill out and return the Satisfaction Questionnaire at the end of the student teaching period.

Follow-up activities were engaged in to maximize returns in the form of telephone reminders, provision of additional forms in cases where the original ones had been misplaced or otherwise used and expression of word of mouth concerns by the researcher.

The AN for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist

As indicated earlier, the researcher had hoped to code two Post-Observation Conference Checklists for each student teacher. The first would be filled out during the researcher's observation of the faculty consultant's feedback session, and the other one, during observation of the cooperating teacher's session. A total of 50 checklists were therefore expected to be filled out by the researcher (see Table 10).

The figures in Table 14 indicate that it was only possible for the researcher to sit in and therefore fill out 31 checklists. Thus an actual total return of 62 percent (31 out of 50) was realised for this instrument.

As was the case with the Feedback Analysis Form, certain factors accounted for the missing checklists. The major factor was that it was not practically feasible for the researcher to observe all the feedback sessions as initially intended. Most sessions, especially those with cooperating teachers, were held in the very late afternoons after school. Even in cases where the researcher stayed late to observe the sessions, she could only do so in one school at a time.

The other factor accounting for the lower than expected rate of returns was that where there were no formal feedback sessions either because there were no formal visits by the faculty consultant to the particular school that particular week or because the student teacher had not taken

TABLE 14

A Comparison of the Intended and the Actual Returns for the Post-Observation Conference Checklist

School	Intended Returns of OCCs	Actual Returns of OCCs	Difference
Afton	4	4	0
Kensington	16	10	- 6
Malmo	8	5	- 3
Meadowlark	10	7	- 3
St. Boniface	12	5	- 7
Total	50	31	-19

over the entire classroom teaching from the cooperating teacher, no observations were made.

On the whole, the fewest observations were made in St. Boniface and Kensington schools. The missing observations were mainly those of cooperating teachers' feedback sessions in three of the five schools (see Table 15) and this, again, was because of time constraints placed on the researcher.

The AN for the Satisfaction Questionnaire

A total of 25 Satisfaction Questionnaires, one for each student teacher, were expected to be returned at the end of the student teaching period (see Table 11). The actual returns were, as shown in Table 16, only 22, that is, 88 percent. The missing three questionnaires were of student teachers in the same school, Kensington.

As mentioned earlier under the discussion of the actual returns of the Feedback Analysis Form, these three non-respondents did not submit the forms expected from them despite several attempts to remind them. The single factor, therefore, accounting for the three missing Satisfaction Questionnaires is that they were expected from the three consistently non-responding student teachers.

Summary of the Intended and the Actual Returns

As shown in Table 12, a total of 275 returns of the three research instruments were expected during the student

TABLE 15

A Comparison of the Intended and Actual Returns of the Post-Observation Conference Checklist by Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers

School	Intended Returns		Actual Returns		Difference	
Afton	FC 2		2		0	
	CT 2		2		0	
Kensington	FC 8		9*		+1*	
	CT 8		1		-7	
Malmo	FC 4		4		0	
	CT 4		1		-3	
Meadowlark	FC 5		2		-3	
	CT 5		5		0	
St. Boniface	FC 6		4		-2	
	CT 6		1		-5	
Total	FC 25	50	21	31	-4	-19
	CT 25		10		-15	

*Two faculty consultants visited the same school in Week 1.

FC = Faculty Consultant

CT = Cooperating Teacher

TABLE 16

A Summary of the Intended and Actual Returns of the Satisfaction Questionnaire

School	Intended Returns	Actual Returns	Difference
Afton	2	2	0
Kensington	8	5	-3
Malmo	4	4	0
Meadowlark	5	5	0
St. Boniface	6	6	0
Total	25	22	-3

teaching period. Table 17, however, shows that there were 202 actual returns of the three instruments. In other words, a total return of 73.5% was realized for the entire sample. A close examination of Table 17 also shows that Afton school had the highest response rate (91.0%) followed by Malmo (86.4%) and Meadowlark (81.8%). The lowest response rate was from St. Boniface school (62.1%). Kensington school had the second lowest response rate (66.0%).

It is interesting to note that Afton school, which had the fewest number of student teachers (2), had the highest response rate and the two schools, St. Boniface and Kensington, which had the most student teachers (6 and 8 respectively), had the lowest response rates.

The experience of the researcher was that the fewer the student teachers in a particular school were, the more cohesively they tended to work among themselves and the easier, therefore, it was for the researcher to communicate her intentions and coordinate the study.

Summary of Factors that Contributed to Non-Response

The only relevant observation that has been drawn at the end of this section is that time constraint was a major determinant of non-response. For faculty consultants, time was a determinant in the sense that given their teaching commitments at the University, the faculty consultants could either not visit all the schools during each of

TABLE 17

A Summary of the Intended and the Actual Returns for the Three Instruments

School	Research Instrument								
	Feedback Analysis Form		Observation Conference Checklist		Satisfaction Questionnaire		Total		Percent of Actual Returns
	IN	AN	IN	AN	IN	AN	IN	AN	
Afton	16	14	4	4	2	2	22	20	91.0
Kensington	64	43	16	10	8	5	88	58	66.0
Malmo	32	29	8	5	4	4	44	38	86.4
Meadowlark	40	33	10	7	5	5	55	45	81.8
St. Boniface	48	30	12	5	6	6	66	41	62.1
Total	200	149	50	31	25	22	275	202	73.5

IN = Intended Returns

AC = Actual Returns

the five weeks, or if they did, they could only manage to observe and therefore hold feedback sessions with as few as two student teachers on a particular day of the week. Thus, in any given school, except for Afton that had only two student teachers, it was not easy to gather all the intended data, especially with the Feedback Analysis Form and the Post-Observation Conference Checklist.

For cooperating teachers, time constraint was a factor in that almost every minute of the day was spent in the classroom with the student teacher. Unless a special session was requested by the researcher at coffee and lunch breaks, most feedback sessions would be held in the late afternoons, after school. In such cases, the sessions would be lengthy, comprising all the feedback for all the lessons taught during the day as well as planning the following day's lesson. Since most cooperating teachers preferred the later afternoon arrangement, the researcher, not having any assistants, was limited as to how many sessions, all going on at the same time in almost all the schools, could be observed. Even in a single school, it was not possible to observe more than two sessions, and this with a lot of time sacrifice of all involved, in a single afternoon.

The fact that student teachers did not teach the classes alone from day one contributed substantially to the missing responses of the Feedback Analysis Form.

With regards to the total return (AN) of 73.5% that was realized for the study, one can insert that it represented an extremely acceptable return, since, as Travers (1964:297) indicated:

> A questionnaire (or any other research instrument) of interest to the recipient may be expected to show only a 20 percent return, even when conditions are favourable. If non-respondents are contacted a second or third time, the return may be increased to 30 percent. Only rarely does it reach the 40 percent level.

That the total returns for each of the three instruments were within the range of 62 percent to 88 percent was considered by the researcher to be satisfactory.

The analyses of the data provided by the procedures described above are done in the next five chapters which follow. It was considered necessary to devote a separate chapter to each research question given the complicated nature of the analyses. This way, the reader/s would hopefully be minimally overwhelmed by the data and it would be easier to extrapolate significant findings for each question without digging through massive data.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICES

Statistical analyses relating to research question 1 and its sub-problems are reported in this chapter. The first research question focused on the effectiveness of supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. The analyses for the three sub-problems, furthermore, sought to detect any differences in the effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers over the four weeks of student teaching as well as the differences between the effectiveness of the two groups of supervisors between and within the schools. For purposes of this chapter and the four data analyses chapters which follow, the research questions are fully stated whereas the sub-problems, listed fully in Chapter 1, are presented as side-headings.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

"To what extent did the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers approach optimal effectiveness according to the 15 propositions of effective feedback derived from the literature review as perceived by the student teachers?"

In response to question 1, the 25 student teachers included in the study were requested to fill out two Feedback Analysis Forms (Appendix A) once every week, one for the faculty consultant's feedback sessions, and the other, for the cooperating teacher's feedback sessions. This was to be done for the four weeks of student teaching. The mean scores for faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were derived from the data on the Feedback Analysis Form (Appendix A). The reader is reminded that the scale on the Feedback Analysis Form was such that the lower the score the more effective (or the nearer to optimal effectiveness) the supervisory practice.

Table 18 shows the rank order of the faculty consultants' mean scores on the fifteen items of the Feedback Analysis Form. In the same table, results of t-tests on the mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers are also presented.

Inspection of Table 18 suggests that faculty consultants approached optimal effectiveness on 14 of the 15 items as indicated by mean scores of 2.48 or lower (better) whereas cooperating teachers approached optimal effectiveness on all the 15 items as indicated by mean scores of 2.38 or lower (better). More specifically, both the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers received the highest scores ($\overline{X}$ = 1.99 or less) on the same three items. Consequently, the supervisory feedback of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers approached optimal effectiveness in

TABLE 18

Rank Order* of Mean Scores and Results of t-Tests on the Process Scores, Item by Item, for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers, All Weeks and Schools Combined

Feedback Analysis Form Item		Faculty Consultant			Cooperating Teachers			Results of t-tests	
		N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	T	P
1. Based on Observations	-- Based on inferences	67	1.90	0.84	82	1.94	1.08	-0.56	0.567
2. Supportive	-- Non-supportive	67	1.91	0.88	82	1.74	1.04	1.04	0.300
3. Useful and Manageable Amount Given	-- Overload given	66	1.99	0.83	81	1.81	1.09	0.76	0.449
4. Emphasized modifiable items	-- Emphasized non-modifiable items	67	2.00	0.92	82	1.99	0.87	0.08	0.934
5. Specific and concrete	-- General and Abstract	67	2.06	0.98	80	2.31	1.17	-1.41	0.162
6. Emphasized Performance	-- Emphasized Personal Qualities	67	2.07	1.03	81	2.07	1.05	0.00	0.997
7. Based on receiver's needs (includes negative criticims)	--Based on giver's needs and what he/she wants to get off his/her chest	66	2.10	0.85	82	2.18	1.23	-0.54	0.593
8. Descriptive	--Evaluative	67	2.20	0.97	80	2.38	1.32	-0.42	0.673
9. Well-timed	--Poorly timed	66	2.24	1.11	82	2.24	1.14	-0.01	0.994
10. Emphasized Alternatives	--Emphasized "the" Path	67	2.30	0.89	81	2.22	1.33	0.42	0.680
11. Framed in "More or Less" terms	--Framed in "Either or" terms	66	2.36	0.91	81	2.24	1.06	0.78	0.436
12. Emphasized requested items	--Emphasized imposed items	66	2.46	0.90	82	2.32	1.16	0.81	0.419
13. Privacy ensured, interruptions and distractions minimized	--No privacy ensured, interruptions and distractions evident	67	2.48	1.20	82	2.20	1.16	1.46	0.147
14 Giver shared information	--Giver gave advice	67	2.70	1.18	81	2.31	1.39	1.83	0.070
15 Checked; receiver encouraged to summarize	--Unchecked; receiver not encouraged to summarize	67	3.15	1.33	82	2.94	1.40	0.93	0.352

*Rank order is based on faculty consultants' mean scores.

their supportiveness, being based on observation rather than inferences and being implemented or given in useful and manageable amounts. The cooperating teachers' feedback approached optimal effectiveness ($\overline{X} = 1.99$) in their emphasis on modifiable items. The faculty consultants were also close to optimal effectiveness on this item ($\overline{X} = 2.00$).

The student teachers, however, perceived the faculty consultants as being low ($\overline{X} = 3.15$) in encouraging the student teachers (receivers) to summarize the main points raised during the feedback sessions as a way of checking understanding. For both groups, however, this dimension departed furthest from optimality.

The t-test results, on the other hand, implied that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on any of the 15 items.

Supervisory Effectiveness Between Schools

Table 19 gives a summary of supervisory effectiveness scores between schools. Inspection of Table 19 suggests that all four faculty consultants were perceived by students as about equally effective since their average scores fell within the same effectiveness score range of 2.00 to 2.50. The effectiveness scores of cooperating teachers were more dispersed. Apart from the one cooperating teacher in school 4 and the two cooperating teachers in school 5, who were perceived as equally effective as the faculty consultants in

TABLE 19

Comparison of Supervisory Effectiveness Scores* of Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers Between Schools

School	Range of Effectiveness Score							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1	✓		x	✓				
2	✓ ✓		x	✓	✓	✓		
3	✓	✓	x	✓	✓			
4	✓	✓ ✓ ✓	x ✓					
5		✓ ✓	x ✓ ✓	✓		✓		

* The lower the score the better

x Faculty Consultant (N = 4)

✓ Cooperating Teacher (N = 22)

the respective schools, the scores of eleven of the eighteen cooperating teachers indicated more effectiveness than the faculty consultants and the scores of four indicated less effectiveness than the faculty consultants. Of the eleven cooperating teachers whose supervisory practices were perceived to be more effective than those of the faculty consultants in the respective schools, five were within the highest effectiveness score range ($\overline{X}$ = 1.50 - 2.00).

The cooperating teachers in schools 1, 2, 3 and 4 had the highest effectiveness scores. School 2 had two cooperating teachers with the highest effectiveness scores. Both the cooperating teachers in school 1 and all the cooperating teachers in school 4 had high effectiveness scores in their supervisory processes. School 4 appeared to be the most effective in terms of supervisory processes, while Schools 1 and 5 were a close second in their effectiveness scores. School 2 had two cooperating teachers with relatively low effectiveness scores and school 3, one cooperating teacher with a low effectiveness score. The one cooperating teacher in school 5 who had a low effectiveness score had also the lowest effectiveness score overall.

Change in Effectiveness Scores

An analysis of variance was carried out to determine the significance of the changes in mean scores of the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on the 15 items over the four weeks of student teaching.

The results of F-tests on the mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers are shown in Table 20. Inspection of these results indicates that the mean scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were not significantly different in any two weeks of student teaching. In other words, the student teachers perceived the supervisory processes of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers as generally consistent week by week.

Effectiveness of Consultants and Cooperating Teachers

Four sets of t-tests were carried out on the average scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on the 15 dimensions of supervisory behavior to determine if there were any significant differences in scores between faculty consultants and cooperating teachers within any one given school.

There were no significant differences between the scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers within schools 1, 2 and 3. There were, however, significant differences in scores on certain items between facutly consultants and cooperating teachers in schools 4 and 5; those are presented in Table 21. In school 4, for example, there were significant differences in scores between faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on the following items: Supportive - Non-supportive; Giver shared information - Giver gave advice; and Emphasized alternatives - Emphasized "the" path; beyond .01 level. On all three items, cooperating

TABLE 20

Results of F-tests on Overall* Mean Effectiveness Scores for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers, Week by Week, all Schools Combined

Week	Faculty Consultants			Cooperating Teachers		
	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	$\overline{X}$	SD
1	16	2.30	0.62	21	2.22	0.75
2	16	2.39	0.47	19	2.01	0.71
3	17	2.26	0.77	20	2.33	0.95
4	19	2.13	0.65	22	2.22	1.06
F Ratio		0.52			0.45	
F Prob.		0.67			0.72	

*Average scores for all items combined

TABLE 21

Items on Which There Were Significant Differences in Supervisory Effectiveness Between Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers in Two Schools

Item	School	Faculty Consultant			Teachers Cooperating				
		N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	T	P
Supportive --Non-supportive	4	14	2.00	0.78	19	1.21	0.42	3.42	0.003**
	5	9	1.22	0.44	21	1.81	1.03	-2.19	0.037*
Giver shared information --Giver gave advice	4	14	2.71	1.07	19	1.53	0.77	3.71	0.001**
Emphasized alternatives --Emphasized "the" path	4	14	2.64	0.63	19	1.95	0.62	3.15	0.004**
Framed in "more or less terms --Framed in "either or" terms	4	14	2.57	0.76	18	2.00	0.59	2.40	0.023*
Based on receiver's needs --Based on giver's needs	5	8	1.50	0.76	21	2.62	1.12	-2.60	0.015*
Useful and manageable amount given --Overload given	4	14	2.00	0.56	19	1.53	0.61	2.29	0.029*
Overall Effectiveness (all 15 items)	4	14	2.20	0.41	19	1.80	0.50	2.49	0.018*

*Significant beyond .05 level **Significant beyond .01 level

N = Number of student teachers who checked the particular item teachers had lower (i.e. "better") mean scores than did faculty consultants in the four weeks of student teaching. In the same school, there were also significant differences in scores between faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on two other items: Framed in "more or less" terms - Framed in "either or" terms and Useful and manageable amount given - Overload given, beyond the .05 level. Again, cooperating teachers had lower mean scores and therefore were more effective on these items than the faculty consultants.

In school 5, the scores for faculty consultants and cooperating teachers differed significantly beyond .05 level on two items: Supportive - Non-supportive and Based on receiver's needs, includes negative criticism - Based on giver's needs and what he/she wants to get off his/her chest. In this school, however, the faculty consultants' mean scores on these two items were lower and therefore indicated more effectiveness than the cooperating teachers. The complete t-test results are presented as Appendix H.

Discussion

Cooperating teachers tended to have numerically lower mean scores on most of the items than did faculty consultants. Although this suggests, that some of their supervisory processes were perceived more favourably by the student teachers than those of faculty consultants, statistical analysis (Table 18) has indicated that to a large extent, both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers employed reasonably effective supervisory feedback processes during the student teaching period. That the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were perceived as about equally effective may be explained by the emergence of shared expectations resulting from the team approach used in workshops and classroom teaching observations with student teachers prior to and during the student teaching period. The slight numerical differences in scores could be attributed, in part, to the increased amount of time which cooperating teachers spent with student teachers on a more regular basis; they also had an advantage over the faculty consultants in that they continued to establish a rapport with student teachers in the cooperating teachers' own familiar schools, and pupils.

The significant differences in scores between the faculty consultant and cooperating teachers in school 4 may be suggestive of the closer involvement of the principal in preparing and supervising cooperating teachers in relation to their interaction with student teachers. School 4 offered the most comfortable working relationship for the researcher and a very healthy cooperative effort by cooperating teachers and the principal. The faculty consultant's higher (less effective) mean scores may have been mainly due to "delays" in observing all student teachers on a more regular basis.

School 5 had a very good working atmosphere too in that the staff and principal gave a lot of support to the researcher. Cooperating teachers, however, tended towards going by the rules in evaluating student teachers. They, too, had group meetings among themselves to determine how to rate their student teachers. The faculty consultant for school 5 spent a lot of time with any individual student teacher he eventually observed. His classroom observations were not always long but his analysis of the teaching was thorough. He also encouraged the student teachers' participation in the feedback session and varied his topics to include personal and informal topics of concern to the student teacher. Consequently, he was perceived more favourably on supportiveness and on basing his feedback on receivers' (student teachers') needs than the cooperating teachers. Thus, the significant differences in scores between the faculty consultant and cooperating teachers in school 5 may have important implications not only for time spent on feedback but also the topic areas of supervisory feedback which are discussed in the next chapter.

A consideration of the differences in overall scores between faculty consultants and cooperating teachers on all the dimensions of supervisory behavior reveals, however, that only in school 4 was such a difference significant (see Table 21). The significant differences in scores between the faculty consultant and cooperating teachers on certain items in school 5 did not result in any significant differences in their overall scores.

CHAPTER 6

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: TOPIC AREAS DISCUSSED IN SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK SESSIONS

Chapter 6 contains the various analyses performed on the data for research question 2 and the seven sub-problems listed with it.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

"What were the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions during the student teaching period in relation to the following sub-problems:

2:1 How often did the topics occur?

2:2 How many topics occurred per session?

2:3 How much time was spent on each topic?

2:4 What was the pattern of initiation of the topics?

2:5 With what topics did the sessions start out?

2:6 What was the general sequence of occurrence of the topics?

2:7 With what topics did the sessions end?"

The Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B) was the source of data regarding topic areas discussed during supervisory feedback sessions. The researcher adopted an unobtrusive approach to checking the topics being discussed every 30 seconds. Given time and other constraints it was not feasible to observe all of the feedback sessions.

The results of the data analysis for research question 2 are discussed under relevant sub-headings below.

Topic Areas Discussed

The data on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist as well as tape recordings and field notes from earlier observations were content analyzed in order to determine what topic areas were discussed during supervisory feedback sessions. The analysis indicated that all of the ten topic areas categorized on the checklist were discussed in one way or other during the sessions. The specific topics that comprised the substance of supervisory feedback sessions were as follows.

1. Personal Qualities. The discussions centered around such aspects of student teacher's personal qualities as voice, poise, mannerisms, tone, self-concept, non-verbal behaviors, tension, patience, tolerance and composure. In most cases, remarks related to personal qualities were positive and complimentary, except in a special case where the supervisor, supported by the student teacher, recognized the student teacher's problem as related to her being continually tense, her overuse of tolerance in dealing with a problem child, and her low self-concept. Voice and poise, however were the single most frequently discussed aspects of personal qualities.

2. Instructional Planning. The topics most frequently discussed under instructional planning were related to amount of time spent on planning the lesson. In most cases the student teachers complained on the one hand, of not having enough time in between classes or after school to plan as well as they wished, and, on the other hand, of spending too much time after school planning for a lesson. The student teachers also gave the general impression that regardless of how thorough the planning was, they seldom enjoyed commensurate satisfaction from teaching the lesson since interruptions and other factors seldom allowed completion of the lesson as planned. Consequently, the question posed to the supervisor by the student teachers regarding instructional planning was "Is planning worth that much time investment?" Planning for the following day's lesson was frequently a concluding remark in the sessions, mainly involving the student teacher and cooperating teacher "planning together" the lesson and suggesting ways of reducing paperwork. The faculty consultants' main interests in instructional planning were to check the generally accepted format and to observe how closely it was followed during the lesson and how the student teachers reacted when the lesson had been taught before the period was over.

3. Content of Lesson. The discussions on lesson content centered around the major components of the lesson such as the stories, puzzles, activities; variation in

content to meet the needs of brighter pupils and slow learners; relevance of the lesson content to the particular period, day or season, for example St. Patrick's Day, Halloween and Christmas; and using language appropriate to the grade level for clarifying and explaining concepts and choosing the right assignment relevant to the lesson.

4. Presentation of Lesson. Questioning skills of the student teacher was the most discussed topic in lesson presentation especially in introducing the lesson. Clarity of instructions given by the student teacher especially in explaining new words and experiences was another important topic. Proper pacing was frequently discussed especially to enable the student teacher to work faster so as to answer most of the children's questions. The nature of the homework and how it was given was a topic discussed frequently at the end of the lesson and as a summary of the lesson. The supervisors, especially cooperating teachers, gave suggestions on specific lesson variation techniques to generate the pupils' interest and also to meet a variety of demands placed on the student teacher by varied abilities and expectations of the pupils. Spelling out words on the chalkboard, handwriting, expansion of pupils' answers to reinforce good efforts and introducing topics in a logical manner from simpler to more difficult ones were some of the other topics.

5. Quality of Interpersonal Relationships. The supportiveness and warmth of the student teacher was the

main theme in the quality of interpersonal relationships. These, in turn, had important bearings on classroom discipline and on the amount of learning that took place in the classroom.

6. Classroom Management. Many topics comprised classroom management including mainly dealing with specific pupils' problems and working with groups of children. Other topics included getting the children's attention; getting the children to respond well and to ask more questions; general awareness in the classroom; minimizing boredom by introducing a variety of activities; giving reasonable work to minimize restlessness and noise; procedure for settling children down after recess; getting assignments completed correctly; checking pupil's speed of work; teacher's helping role during the lesson; aspiring for greater involvement of all children; managing activities; correcting workbooks and assignments; and performing instrumental tasks such as collecting chalk, taking the register, and distributing name tags.

7. Discipline. The major topic of discussion was how to handle problem children and to solve other classroom problems effectively without the assistance of the cooperating teacher. An example which came up in the discussions was when the student teacher actually reseated a problem child and isolated the other offender. Later she was commended by the cooperating teacher for the action because it was regarded as effective in reinforcing the desired

behavior.

8. Review of Performance. The introductory topic in this category would most often be the supervisor asking the student teacher "How did the lesson go" or "What did you think of the lesson?" The student teacher would then review the previous lesson, going over what she thought were strengths and weaknesses and asking the supervisor to comment on the various aspects of the lesson which were of concern to the student teacher.

Another approach involved the supervisor handing over observation notes of the previous lesson and inviting the student teacher to react to the various comments made by the supervisor.

A third, but almost as frequently used approach, was a straight forward complimentary comment by the supervisor to the student teacher, for example, "That was a great lesson. I could almost see the kids enjoying it. That is what I call an effective teaching and learning situation." In this specific instance, the student teacher modestly responded: "Thank you, but I wish I had not introduced that topic at the beginning. It almost ruined my whole lesson." A step by step discussion would then follow between the supervisor and student teacher.

The least frequently used approach involved an instance during which the supervisor gave all of the comments about the lesson and then asked the already frustrated or exhilarated student teacher to "comment on the comments."

9. Informal Conversation. Job interviews were the major topics in informal conversation. This was understandable since the student teachers were in their final weeks at university and had developed an understandable interest in job opportunities. The supervisors were equally keen to know where the student teachers might likely find employment.

Occasionally the student teachers and supervisors, especially faculty consultants, laughed and joked about week-end parties, government policies (especially those related to university education), and other tension relieving topics. Weather and sports were sometimes mentioned somewhere during the discussion, and probably served to relieve tension or establish communication lines.

10. Others. The topics which fell under "Other" categories included mainly setting up a schedule for the faculty consultants' visits, the student teachers' workloads and timetable, hours and length of the student teaching period, and final evaluation. During the supervisory sessions led by faculty consultants, the student teachers also discussed the cooperating teacher-student teacher relationship, concerns arising from long hours spent on planning lessons, and what was happening with other student teachers in other schools. In the sessions with cooperating

teachers, the student teachers asked when they would be expected to teach their classes alone, especially towards the end of the second week of student teaching.

Whenever the final evaluation was discussed, the student teachers tended to be concerned about whether they would be involved in the evaluation and what the nature of the involvement would be. The other topics which were mentioned in this category included recommendations by the supervisors of upcoming events such as professional development days and conferences to the student teachers, sharing by student teachers of their concerns about lengthy periods of student teaching and, the effects of unexpected visits by the faculty consultants on the student teachers' classroom performances.

Frequency of Occurrence of the Topics and Time Spent on Each for the Total Sample

In Table 22 is presented a summary of the percent of occurrence and time spent on each of the topics for the total sample.

Examination of Table 22 reveals that the topic that occurred most frequently in the 275 occurrences was classroom management (23.3%). The other topics discussed during supervisory feedback sessions, in descending order of percent of occurrence were as follows: presentation of lesson (21.2%); review of performance (11.3%); instructional planning (11.3%); content of lesson (9.5%); others (8.7%);

TABLE 22

Occurrence and Time Spent on Each Topic for all the Supervisors

Topic Areas	Occurrence		Time Spent in Minutes		
	f	%	Total	%	Mean
Classroom Management	64	23.3	120.0	26.8	1.9
Presentation of Lesson	58	21.1	110.0	24.6	1.9
Instructional Planning	31	11.3	62.5	14.0	2.0
Review of Performance	31	11.3	21.5	4.8	0.7
Content of Lesson	26	9.5	42.0	9.4	1.6
Others	24	8.7	24.0	5.4	1.0
Discipline	18	6.5	36.0	8.0	2.0
Personal Qualities	10	3.6	18.5	4.1	1.8
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	9	3.3	10.0	2.2	1.1
Informal Conversation	4	1.5	3.5	0.8	0.9
Total	275	100.0	448.0	100.0	1.6

discipline (6.5%); personal qualities (3.6%); quality of interpersonal relationship (3.3%); and, informal conversation (1.5%).

A consideration of the total time spent on each topic in the same Table 22 shows an obvious relationship between frequency of occurrence of the topics and the total time spent on the topics. Thus the topics that were most frequently discussed had the most total time spent on them. Once again, classroom management and presentation of lesson had almost twice as much total percent of time spent on them as instructional planning and content of lesson and three to four times as much time spent on them as the remaining topics.

Inspection of the average amount of time spent on each topic per session, however, revealed a slightly different order of events. The average time provides a basis for understanding how much time was spent on each topic per session even if it occurred only once during the whole feedback session.

Instructional planning and discipline, although they occurred less frequently than some of the other topics, had the highest average amount of time ($\overline{X}$ = 2.0 min.) spent on them. What this means is that whenever these topics were discussed, regardless of their lower frequency of occurrence, more time was spent on discussing them than on the other topics. This may be an indication of their importance in the student teachers' performance and of the difficulties experienced in obtaining acceptable ways of dealing with the topics.

Classroom management and presentation of lesson had closer average time ($\overline{X}$ = 1.9 mins.) spent on them to that spent on instructional planning and discipline. Personal qualities ($\overline{X}$ = 1.8 mins.) and content of lesson ($\overline{X}$ = 1.6 mins.) had the third highest average time spent on them per session. The other topics, however, had only half as much time spent on them as was spent on instructional planning, discipline and classroom management (see Table 22).

Discussion. It may be stated from the findings that classroom management and presentation of lesson were possibly the two most important aspects of student teaching since they were discussed twice as frequently as were instructional planning and review of performance, and almost three times as much as the other topics.

On the one hand these two areas were possibly the ones in which the student teachers demonstrated their teaching skills to the greatest extent, independent of the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. Their sensitivity to varied classroom situations and their ability to adapt their lessons to suit particular needs, moods and other contingencies may have become evident in these two areas. On the other hand, it may have been that the student teachers were having the most problems in these two areas. Their ability to improvise and deal with problem cases would therefore be put to the test mostly in these areas, consequently resulting in the supervisors talking about these two topics most frequently.

If the student teachers had opportunities to 'act' in their own ways in their classroom management and presentation of lesson, then they were bound to perform just as well as they could and to make mistakes or fail to be understood by the supervisors. Compliments, clarifications, explanations, and sometimes misunderstandings would therefore help to explain the more frequent mention of these two important topics. This does not mean, however, that the other topics were not important. In most cases as the discussions went back and forth between classroom management and presentation of lesson, a mention would be made of instructional planning, content of lesson and discipline, and these would be in the form of a review of performance. Thus, most of these topics had overlapping themes with the main themes comprising classroom management and presentation of lesson. The topics included under "Others" were highly varied and had the lower percent of occurrence. Some of these topics were not necessarily related to the lesson and needed no repeated clarifications. Personal qualities, nature of interpersonal relationship and informal conversation were topics which could be both sensitive and also applicable to a particular supervisor, student teacher, school, classroom or grade level and pupils. In most cases, a brief mention or two served to clarify the point in question.

Comparison of Occurrence of Topics for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers

The data presented in Table 23 show the differences in the frequency and percent of occurrence of the topics in the faculty consultants' and the cooperating teachers' feedback sessions.

An observation from Table 23 is that the faculty consultants discussed the "Other" topics, quality of interpersonal relationships, informal conversation, discipline, and personal qualities, more frequently than cooperating teachers. The cooperating teachers however, discussed content of lesson, review of performance, instructional planning, presentation of lesson, and classroom management more than faculty consultants.

Discussion. The figures presented in Table 23 above indicate that there were some differences in the frequency and percent of occurrence of the topics in the faculty consultants' and cooperating teachers' feedback sessions. Such differences, however, did not seem to be very significant.

Generally, however the occurrence of the topics seemed higher in the cooperating teachers' sessions for topics which had higher frequencies of occurrence for the total sample, and higher in the faculty consultants' sessions for topics which had lower frequencies of occurrence

TABLE 23

Comparison of Occurrence of the Topics in the Faculty Consultants' and the Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions

Topic Areas	Faculty Consultants		Cooperating Teachers		Difference
	f	%	f	%	%
Classroom Management	37	23.1	27	23.5	-0.4
Presentation of Lesson	33	20.6	25	21.7	-1.1
Others	17	10.6	7	6.1	+4.5
Instructional Planning	16	10.0	15	13.0	-3.0
Review of Performance	16	10.0	15	13.0	-3.0
Content of Lesson	12	7.5	14	12.2	-4.7
Discipline	11	6.9	7	6.1	+0.8
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	8	5.0	1	0.9	+4.1
Personal Qualities	6	3.8	4	3.5	+0.3
Informal Conversation	4	2.5	0	0.0	+2.5
Total	160	100.0	115	100.0	---

for the total sample.

The more frequently occurring topics could have been more objectively related to classroom teaching and observable lesson presentation and general performance. Both the cooperating teachers and faculty consultants could therefore discuss them confidently based on observable, tangible data. The cooperating teachers discussed them even more frequently since they were with the student teachers almost all of the time every day of classroom teaching. The faculty consultants discussed them almost as frequently although slightly less since they were able to observe each student teacher only once or twice a week given faculty commitments at the university. Whereas each cooperating teacher was responsible for only one student teacher, thus having more concentrated observation and feedback opportunities, the faculty consultants had each at least four to six student teachers. This placed some constraint on what they could talk about, how often they could talk about it and how much time they could dedicate to talking about it.

The topics that occurred least frequently were such that they tended to be related to personal, subjective or disciplinary aspects of student teachers' classroom teaching. As such, a 'sensitive' relationship like that between the cooperating teachers and student teachers could only be maintained by more objective approaches. The faculty consultants, who had more background information on the student teachers, having been the student teachers' instructors for a reasonable length of time, could discuss these topics more confidently without as great a fear of affecting the relationship as the cooperating teachers had. The part that cooperating teachers played in the final evaluation of student teachers could have also created an uneasy atmosphere.

Comparison of Time Spent on Each Topic by Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers

The percent of total time and the average time spent on each topic by the faculty consultants and the cooperating teachers' are presented in Table 24. The data in Table 24 indicate that faculty consultants spent a higher percentage of their time discussing discipline, classroom management, personal qualities, quality of interpersonal relationship, "other" topics and informal conversation. The cooperating teachers, on the other hand, spent a higher percentage of their time discussing instructional planning, content of lesson, review of performance and presentation of lesson.

Observation of the differences in the average time spent on the topics indicates that the faculty consultants spent more average time discussing discipline and personal qualities. The cooperating teachers spent more average time than the faculty consultants in discussing instructional planning. There was no difference in the average time spent by faculty consultants and cooperating teachers discussing content of lesson and the "other" topics.

TABLE 24

Comparison of Time* Spent on Each Topic in the Faculty Consultants' and Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions

Topic Areas	Faculty Consultants			Cooperating Teachers			Difference		
	Total Time	%	$\bar{X}$	Total Time	%	$\bar{X}$	Total Time	%	$\bar{X}$
Classroom Management	79.5	29.0	2.1	40.5	23.3	1.5	+39.0	+5.7	+0.6
Presentation of Lesson	67.0	24.5	2.0	43.0	24.7	1.7	+24.0	-0.2	+0.3
Discipline	30.0	10.9	2.7	6.0	3.4	0.9	+24.0	+7.5	+1.8
Instructional Planning	22.5	8.2	1.4	40.0	23.0	2.7	-17.5	-14.8	-1.3
Content of Lesson	19.5	7.1	1.6	22.5	12.9	1.6	- 3.0	- 5.8	0.0
Others	17.0	6.2	1.0	7.0	4.0	1.0	+10.0	+ 2.2	0.0
Personal Qualities	14.0	5.1	2.3	4.5	2.6	1.1	+10.5	+ 2.5	+1.2
Review of Performance	12.0	4.4	0.8	9.5	5.5	0.6	+ 2.5	- 1.1	+0.2
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	9.0	3.3	1.1	1.0	0.6	1.0	+ 8.0	2.7	0.1
Informal Conversation	3.5	1.3	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	+ 3.5	+ 1.3	+0.9
Total	274.0	100.0	1.7	174.0	100.0	1.5	- -	- -	- -

*Denotes time in minutes

Discussion. There was a general tendency for cooperating teachers to spend more time than faculty consultants in performance related topics such as presentation of lesson, instructional planning, content of lesson and review of performance, the same topics that occurred more frequently and had more overall time spent on them. Faculty consultants, on the other hand, tended to spend more time than the cooperating teachers on subjective person-related topics like personal qualities, quality of interpersonal relationship, discipline, informal conversation and the "other" topics. Again, as discussed earlier, the closer working relationship between the cooperating teachers and student teachers on a daily basis may have contributed to their spending more time on the performance related topics than the faculty consultants.

The Number of Topics that Occurred per Session

The average number of topics that occurred per session in the faculty consultants' and cooperating teachers' feedback sessions are shown in Table 48 together with the data for sub-problem 4:2. A consideration of the average number of topics that occurred per session for the total sample indicates that an average of 4.65 topics were discussed per session. The faculty consultants, however, used fewer topics (4.20) per session than the cooperating teachers who used an average of 5.45 topics per session (see page 215).

Discussion. From the figures presented above, the cooperating teachers tended to discuss more topics per session than the faculty consultants. Once again, the amount of time available for closer interactions between cooperating teachers and student teachers on a more regular basis may explain this. The implications of the average number of topics discussed per session for the effectiveness of supervisory feedback are discussed in a later section of subproblem 4:2.

Pattern of Initiation of Topics

A summary of percent of initiation of topics for the total sample is presented in Table 25. Data in Table 25 suggest that except for classroom management, informal conversation and discipline where there seemed to be a balance in the initiation of topics by the supervisors and student teachers, the supervisors tended to initiate most of the other topics almost all of the time as indicated by the high range of percent of supervisor initiation of topics (65 to 90 percent). These figures suggest that the supervisory feedback sessions were, in most cases, directive and dominated by supervisory comments and suggestions. The student teachers tended only to respond to supervisors' questions, comments or challenges.

Comparison of Topic Initiation Between Faculty Consultants and Student Teachers

The data showing percent of the pattern of initiation

TABLE 25

Frequency and Percent of Initiation of Topics for the Total Sample

Topic Areas	Supervisor		Student Teacher		Both		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	9	90.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	10	3.6
Instructional Planning	26	83.9	4	12.9	1	3.2	31	11.3
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	7	77.8	0	0.0	2	22.2	9	3.3
Content of Lesson	20	76.9	4	15.4	2	7.7	26	9.5
Review of Performance	22	71.0	6	19.4	3	9.7	31	11.3
Presentation of Lesson	38	65.5	11	19.0	9	15.5	58	21.1
Classroom Management	34	53.1	14	21.9	16	25.0	64	23.3
Informal Conversation	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	4	1.5
Others	12	50.0	7	29.2	5	20.8	24	8.7
Discipline	8	44.4	8	44.4	2	11.1	18	6.5
TOTAL	178	64.7	56	20.4	41	14.9	275	100.0

of the topics between faculty consultants and student teachers are included in Table 26. The figures in Table 26 suggest that the faculty consultants significantly dominated the initiation of instructional planning (87.5%), quality of interpersonal relationship (87.5%), content of lesson (83.3%), personal qualities (83.3%), review of performance (68.8%), and presentation of lesson (63.6%). The faculty consultants also initiated more frequently the "other" topics and classroom management. The faculty consultants and student teachers initiated informal conversation as a topic for discussion in the feedback sessions almost equally. The student teachers dominated the initiation of discipline, though, to a smaller extent (45.5%). Initiation of the topics by both faculty consultants and student teachers was limited within the range of 29% for initiation of classroom management to 6.3% for initiation of review of performance. There was no such interactive initiation of instructional planning, content of lesson and informal conversation.

Comparison of Topics of Initiation Between Cooperating Teacners and Student Teachers

In Table 27 are presented data showing percent of initiation of topics between cooperating teachers and student teachers. The figures on Table 27 indicate that the cooperating teachers initiated most frequently personal qualities all of the time, instructional planning 80.8% of the time, review of performance 73.3% of the time, content

TABLE 26

Comparison of Initiation of Topics Between Faculty Consultants and Student Teachers

Topic Areas	Faculty Consultant		Student Teacher		Both		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Instructional Planning	14	87.5	2	12.5	0	0.0	16	10.0
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	7	87.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	8	5.0
Content of Lesson	10	83.3	2	16.7	0	0.0	12	7.5
Personal Qualities	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	6	3.8
Review of Performance	11	68.8	4	25.0	1	6.3	16	10.0
Presentation of Lesson	21	63.6	8	24.2	4	12.1	33	20.6
Others	10	58.8	4	23.5	3	17.6	17	10.6
Classroom Management	21	56.8	5	13.5	11	29.7	37	23.1
Informal Conversation	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	4	2.5
Discipline	4	36.4	5	45.5	2	18.2	11	6.9
TOTAL	105	65.6	32	20.0	23	14.4	160	100.0

TABLE 27

Comparison of Percent of Initiation of Topics Between Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

Topic Areas	Cooperating Teachers		Student Teacher		Both		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.5
Instructional Planning	12	80.0	2	13.3	1	6.7	15	13.0
Review of Performance	11	73.3	2	13.3	2	13.3	15	13.0
Content of Lesson	10	71.4	2	14.3	2	14.3	14	12.2
Presentation of Lesson	17	68.0	3	12.0	5	20.0	25	21.7
Discipline	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0.0	7	6.1
Classroom Management	13	48.1	9	33.3	5	18.5	27	13.0
Others	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	7	6.1
Informal Conversation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.9
TOTAL	73	63.5	24	20.9	18	15.7	115	100.0

of lesson 71.4% of the time and presentation of lesson 68.0% of the time. The cooperating teachers also initiated discipline (57.1%) and classroom management (48.1%) more frequently. The student teachers only initiated the "Other" topics for discussion, and this to a much lesser extent (42.9%). The only interactive occasion was when both the cooperating teachers and student teachers initiated interpersonal relationships as a topic for discussion.

The range for interactive initiation of topics between cooperating teachers and student teachers was also limited from 28.6% for interactive initiation of "Other" topics to 6.7% for interactive initiation of instructional planning. There was no interactive initiation of topics like personal qualities, discipline and informal conversation.

Discussion. Interpretations of the observations above suggest that faculty consultants took the initiative in the discussion of the topics related to the "theories" of teaching. Since the faculty consultants were the student teachers' instructors, they may have had more interest in observing that the theories the student teachers were taught at the university had been properly learned and utilized in practice in the form of instructional planning, organizing the contents of the lesson, managing the class and relating to the children and staff in the school.

The cooperating teachers, on the other hand, made observations based on their actual teaching experience in the relevant grade levels and those aspects of teaching which enhanced pupil learning and were acceptable practices in the school. Thus the cooperating teachers had more interest in personal qualities, presentation of lesson, discipline and review of performance. Those aspects of personal qualities that cooperating teachers discussed mainly comprised compliments of student teachers' poise, voice, tone and personality while teaching. Whereas faculty consultants dominated sessions in topic areas which probably suggested "the way it is supposed to be" the cooperating teachers dominated the sessions in topics that perhaps suggested "the way it is, the way it works and the way it has worked for me and the pupils and so can work for you." The student teachers, however, only responded where necessary or engaged in other topics which would not "unveil whatever the supervisor did not observe" except when it was a serious discipline case of a known problem child or some successful innovative attempts by the student teacher to do something new or different. As such, the student teachers' dominated discussions relating to discipline in the faculty consultants' sessions and those related to the "other" topics in cooperating teachers' sessions. In general, there was very minimal interactive discussion of the topics between supervisors and student teachers.

Topics with Which Feedback Sessions Started Out

In Table 28, frequency of the topics with which the supervisory feedback sessions started out is presented. Review of performance was the topic most used (35.5%) in starting out the sessions. The cooperating teachers, however, used this topic more than twice (54.5%) as often as the faculty consultants (25.0%). The second most used topic in starting out the sessions was instructional planning (16.1%). The cooperating teachers also used this topic in starting out their sessions more (18.2%) than did the faculty consultants (15.1%). The topics which were used less frequently in starting out the sessions were presentation of lesson (12.9%), discipline (9.7%), classroom management (9.7%) and content of lesson (9.7%). These topics were, however, used more frequently in starting out faculty consultants' sessions than in starting out cooperating teacher's sessions. The least frequently used topics in starting out either of the sessions were personal qualities (3.2%) and the "other" topics (3.2%). Personal qualities and the "Other" topics were only used by faculty consultants to start out their sessions.

Quality of interpersonal relationship and informal conversation were not used at all in starting out either of the sessions.

Discussion. That review of performance was the topic most frequently used in starting out the sessions can

TABLE 28

Frequency and Percent of the Topics with Which Supervisory Feedback Sessions Started Out

Topic Areas	Faculty Consultants		Cooperating Teachers		Total	
	f	%		%	f	%
Review of Performance	5	25.0	6	54.5	11	35.5
Instructional Planning	3	15.0	2	18.2	5	16.1
Presentation of Lesson	3	15.0	1	9.1	4	12.9
Discipline	3	15.0	0	0.0	3	9.7
Content of Lesson	2	10.0	1	9.1	3	9.7
Classroom Management	2	10.0	1	9.1	3	9.7
Personal Qualities	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	3.2
Other Topics	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	3.2
TOTAL	20	100.0	11	100.0	31	100.0

be explained in terms of the expectations the supervisors and student teachers have of each other regarding a previously taught lesson. Neither supervisor nor student is sure where or how to start out the session. To establish rapport and set the discussion topics going without being critical at the outset and therefore blocking further communication, the supervisors started out more frequently on the neutral ground: "What did you think of the lesson . . .?" By the time the student teacher commented on various parts of the lesson, the supervisor would be ready to analyze the identified concerns and the session would be under way. The least frequently used topics were sensitive ones which needed supervisor's tactfulness in mentioning sometime during the session without necessarily creating tension. Performance may also be more related to pupil learning than personal qualities and other person-oriented topics.

The Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics

The sequence of occurrence of the topics as initial and second topics are presented in Table 29 for the total sample, Table 30 for faculty consultants and, Table 31 for cooperating teachers.

Classroom Management was the most frequently occurring topic both as an initial topic (25.0%) and as a second topic (25.0%), for all the three circumstances included in the tables. Presentation of lesson was the second most frequently occurring topic as an initial topic

TABLE 29

Percent of Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics for the Total Sample

Second Topics	Personal Qualities		Instructional Planning		Content of Lesson		Presentation of Lesson		Quality of Interpersonal Relationship		Classroom Management		Discipline		Review of Performance		Informal Conversation		Other Topics		Total	
Initial Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	-	-	2	20.0	1	10.0	3	30.0*	1	10.0	3	30.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	4.1
Instructional Planning	-	-	-	-	6	24.0	4	16.0	-	-	4	16.0	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	10	40.0*	25	10.2
Content of Lesson	-	-	5	19.2	1	3.8	9	34.6*	-	-	6	23.1	-	-	3	11.5	1	3.8	1	3.8	26	10.7
Presentation of Lesson	1	2.1	4	8.5	8	17.0	1	2.1	3	6.4	19	40.4*	2	4.3	5	10.6	-	-	4	8.5	47	19.3
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	3	33.3*	-	-	-	-	2	22.2	-	-	4	44.4*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	3.7
Classroom Management	3	4.9	5	8.2	4	6.6	27	44.3*	2	3.3	1	1.6	10	16.4	6	9.8	-	-	3	4.9	61	25.0
Discipline	1	6.7	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	2	13.3	6	40.0*	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	15	6.1
Review of Performance	1	3.6	3	10.7	2	7.1	3	10.7	1	3.6	11	39.3*	1	3.6	-	-	2	7.1	4	14.3	28	11.5
Informal Conversation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50.0*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50.0*	-	-	-	-	2	0.8
Other Topics	-	-	7	33.3*	1	4.8	3	14.3	-	-	7	33.3*	1	4.8	2	9.5	-	-	-	-	21	8.6
Total	9	3.7	26	10.7	23	9.4	54	22.1	9	3.7	61	25.0	15	6.1	20	8.2	4	1.6	23	9.4	244	100.0

* strong link (26% - 50%)

TABLE 30

Percent of Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the Faculty Consultants' Feedback Sessions

Second Topics	Personal Qualities		Instructional Planning		Content of Lesson		Presentation of Lesson		Quality of Interpersonal Relationship		Classroom Management		Discipline		Review of Performance		Informal Conversation		Other Topics		Total	
Initial Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	-	-	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3*	1	16.7	1	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	4.3
Instructional Planning	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	8	61.5	13	9.3
Content of Lesson	-	-	1	8.3	-	-	5	41.7*	-	-	3	25.0	-	-	2	16.7	1	8.3	-	-	12	8.6
Presentation of Lesson	-	-	2	8.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	11	44.0*	1	4.0	1	4.0	-	-	2	8.0	25	17.9
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	3	37.5*	-	-	-	-	1	12.5	-	-	4	50.0*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	5.7
Classroom Management	-	-	1	2.9	2	5.7	16	45.7*	2	5.7	1	2.9	6	17.1	4	11.4	-	-	3	8.6	35	25.0
Discipline	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	2	22.2	3	33.3*	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	1	11.1	9	6.4
Review of Performance	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	4	26.7	1	6.7	-	-	2	13.3	2	13.3	15	10.7
Informal Conversation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50.0*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50.0*	-	-	-	-	2	1.4
Other Topics	-	-	6	40.0*	-	-	2	13.3	-	-	5	33.3*	-	-	2	13.3	-	-	-	-	15	10.7
Total	5	3.6	13	9.3	10	7.1	30	21.4	8	5.7	35	25.0	8	5.7	11	7.9	4	2.9	16	11.4	140	100.0

* strong link (26% - 50%)
** very strong link (51% - 75%)

(19.3% for the total sample; 17.9% in faculty consultants' sessions and 21.2% in cooperating teachers' sessions) and as a second topic (22.1% for the total sample; 21.4% in cooperating teachers' sessions). The other topics which occurred less frequently as initial and second topics were instructional planning, content of lesson, review of performance and the other topics. As initial and second topics, personal qualities, quality of interpersonal relationship and informal conversation occurred least frequently in all the sessions.

The data presented in Tables 29, 30 and 31 also provided some insight into the strength of the linkage between initial and second topics which in turn, were used to describe the nature in which the topics tended to be discussed in relation to each other.

For the total sample, (Table 29) classroom management had a relatively strong link as a second topic, to quality of interpersonal relationship (44.4%), presentation of lesson (40.4%); discipline (40.0%); review of performance (39.3%); other topics (33.3%) and personal qualities (30.0%) and a relatively weak link to content of lesson (23.1%) and instructional planning (16.0%). The same strength of linkage was observed in faculty consultants' and cooperating teachers' sessions though the percentage points differed slightly. In cooperating teachers' sessions, for example, classroom management had a very strong link (53.8%) as a second topic to review of performance.

TABLE 31

Percent of Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the Cooperating Teacher's Feedback Sessions

Second Topics	Personal Qualities		Instructional Planning		Content of Lesson		Presentation of Lesson		Quality of Interpersonal Relationship		Classroom Management		Discipline		Review of Performance		Informal Conversation		Other Topics		Total	
Initial Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	-	-	1	25.0	-	-	1	25.0	-	-	2	50.0*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3.8
Instructional Planning	-	-	-	-	5	41.7*	4	33.3*	-	-	1	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	16.7	12	11.5
Content of Lesson	-	-	4	28.6*	1	7.1	4	28.6*	-	-	3	21.4	-	-	1	7.1	-	-	1	7.1	14	13.5
Presentation of Lesson	1	4.5	2	9.1	3	13.6	-	-	1	4.5	8	36.4*	1	4.5	4	18.2	-	-	2	9.1	22	21.2
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.0
Classroom Management	3	11.5	4	15.4	2	7.7	11	42.3*	-	-	-	-	4	15.4	2	7.7	-	-	-	-	26	25.0
Discipline	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50.0*	1	16.7	2	33.3*	-	-	-	-	6	5.8
Review of Performance	-	-	1	7.7	1	7.7	2	15.4	-	-	7	53.8*	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	15.4	13	12.5
Informal Conversation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Topics	-	-	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	-	-	2	33.3	1	16.7	-	-		-	-	-	6	5.8
Total	4	3.8	13	12.5	13	12.5	24	23.1	1	1.0	26	25.0	7	6.7	9	8.7	-	-	7	6.7	104	100.0

* - strong link (26% - 50%)
** - very strong link (51% - 75%)
*** - significantly strong link (76% - 100%)

Presentation of lesson, on the other hand, had a relatively strong link as a second topic to informal conversation (50.0%), classroom management (44.3%), content of lesson (34.6%) and personal qualities (30.0%), and a relatively weak link as a second topic to quality of interpersonal relationship (22.2%), instructional planning (16.0%), other topics (14.3%), review of performance (10.7%), and discipline (6.7%). The other stronger links were observed between review of performance as a second topic to informal conversation (50.0%), other topics as a second topic to instructional planning (40.0%), instructional planning as a second topic to other topics (33.3%), and personal qualities as a second topic to quality of interpersonal relationship (33.3%).

In the faculty consultants' feedback sessions, a very strong link was found to exist between the other topics as second topics to instructional planning (61.5%). The other strong linkages of second topics to initial topics included presentation of lesson to informal conversation (50.0%), review of performance to informal conversation (50.0%), classroom management to quality of interpersonal relationship (50.0%), presentation of lesson to classroom management (45.7%), classroom management to presentation of lesson (44.0%), presentation of lesson to content of lesson (41.7%), instructional planning to other topics (40.0%), personal qualities to quality of interpersonal relationship (37.5%), presentation of lesson to personal qualities (37.5%), classroom management to discipline (33.3%) and classroom management to other topics (33.3%).

In the cooperating teachers' feedback sessions, a significantly strong link (100.0%) existed between presentation of lesson as a second topic to quality of interpersonal relationship, and a very strong link (53.8%) existed between classroom management as a second topic to review of performance. The other strong links were observed in the occurrence of classroom management as a second topic to personal qualities and to discipline (50.0%), presentation of lesson as a second topic to classroom management (42.3%), content of lesson as a second topic to instructional planning (41.7%), classroom management as a second topic to presentation of lesson (36.4%), presentation of lesson as a second topic to instructional planning (33.3%), classroom management as a second topic to other topics (33.3%), and review of performance as a second topic to discipline (33.3%). The pictorial representations of the linkage are included in Appendix I as Figures 1 and 2.

Discussion. Classroom management and presentation of lesson were the most frequently occurring topics both as initial and as second topics. To a certain extent the two topics may be seen as the core or key topics in feedback sessions. The observation that they tended to have stronger links as initial and as second topics to most of the other topics in both sessions may suggest that they may have some useful relationship to effective teaching. Most other teaching performance results from, or depends on classroom management and presentation of lesson as portrayed by their frequency of occurrence. There were however other topics that had reasonably strong links with the initial topics. Such were instructional planning, content of lesson, review of performance, discipline and the other topics. These topics, though they did not occur as frequently, as initial or second topics, warrant some reasonable amount of attention if teaching is to be successful. The frequent occurrence of these topics as weakly linked to the initial topics suggested this caution. Particular attention, however, should be given to the quality of interpersonal realtionship and personal qualities if successful presentation of lesson and classroom management is the goal.

A final observation was that informal conversation could be an isolated topic especially as implied in lack of linkage with any other topic in cooperating teachers' feedback sessions, or it could be a general topic of discussion encompassing some aspects of presentation of lesson as an informal way of reviewing the student teachers' performance as suggested by the strong link between the three topics observed in the faculty consultants' feedback sessions.

Topics with Which Supervisory Sessions Ended

The frequency of the topics with which supervisory feedback sessions ended is presented in Table 32.

TABLE 32

Frequency and Percent of the Topics with Which Supervisory Feedback Sessions Ended

Topic Areas	Faculty Consultants		Cooperating Teachers		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Presentation of Lesson	8	40.0	3	27.3	11	35.5
Instructional Planning	3	15.0	3	27.3	6	19.4
Classroom Management	2	10.0	1	9.1	3	9.7
Discipline	2	10.0	1	9.1	3	9.7
Other Topics	2	10.0	1	9.1	3	9.7
Review of Performance	1	5.0	2	18.2	3	9.7
Informal Conversation	2	10.0	0	0.0	2	6.5
TOTAL	20	100.0	11	100.0	31	100.0

Presentation of lesson was used the most (35.5%) in ending both supervisory sessions. The faculty consultants however used this topic more often (40.0%) than cooperating teachers (27.3%). The cooperating teachers used instructional planning as frequently (27.3%) as they used presentation of lesson (27.3%) and also used review of performance more (18.2%) than faculty consultants (5.0%) to end their sessions. It was only the faculty consultants, however, who used informal conversation to end their sessions (10.0%). The cooperating teachers did not use this topic at all to end their feedback sessions. Classroom management, discipline, and the "other" topics were used by faculty consultants almost as frequently (10.0%) as they were used by cooperating teachers (9.1%) to end the sessions.

Discussion. The cooperating teachers tended to relate the previous lesson to the following ones and this tendency explains why they would talk about presentation of lesson and then instructional planning. The link assisted the cooperating teachers and student teachers in planning the next lesson from where the previous one ended. The faculty consultants were less involved in cooperative planning of the lesson and therefore, concentrated their final remarks more on what they observed during the teaching (presentation of lesson) and what could be maintained or done differently next time.

CHAPTER 7

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS WITH SUPERVISORY PRACTICES IN FEEDBACK SESSIONS

Chapters 5 and 6 presented the data generated by the Feedback Analysis Form and the Post-Observation Conference Checklist items. In Chapter 7, analyses of the data derived from the Satisfaction Questionnaire (Appendix C) items are presented in order to address research question 3. Research question 3 investigated the extent to which the student teachers were satisfied with supervisory practices in feedback sessions for the entire period of student teaching.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

"To what extent did the student teachers express satisfaction with supervisory practices in feedback sessions during the student teaching period?"

The analyses of the data for this research question are presented in this chapter in three parts. First, a Factor Analysis carried out on the first 28 items of the Satisfaction Questionnaire is discussed.

The second part comprises the analysis of the responses related to satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory feedback in enhancing selected teaching practices as well as their satisfaction with various locations used for holding feedback sessions. The content analysis of the open-ended items of the questionnaire is included in the final part of the analyses.

The Factor Analysis

A factor analysis was carried out on the basis of the responses of 22 usable questionnaires returned. Preliminary examinations of the eigenvalues suggested the use of a five-factor solution following the normal varimax method of rotation (Ferguson, 1971:424) for the 28 satisfaction items on Part A of the questionnaire.

Part A of the Satisfaction Questionnaire comprised 28 items designed to elicit information about the extent to which the student teachers were satisfied with selected processes of supervisory feedback of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. The respondents were also asked to give two responses for each item; one for the faculty consultant and one for the cooperating teacher. The results of the factor analysis on the two sets of data are shown in Table 33. Elimination of certain items and factors was effected in accordance with the following decision rules (Hewitson, 1975:133):

1) Item loadings should be above 0.447 (or contribute 20% or more of the variance to the communality of the factor).
2) Item communalities should be above 0.300.
3) Item loadings should be decisively on one factor only.

TABLE 33

Factor Analysis: Satisfaction Items

Variable	Communality	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
SAT. 1	0.72	0.12	-0.01	0.82	0.12	-0.12
SAT. 2	0.71	0.01	0.81	0.05	-0.21	-0.03
SAT. 3	0.75	-0.72	-0.04	0.20	-0.31	-0.30
SAT. 4	0.84	-0.42	0.25	-0.05	-0.75	-0.19
SAT. 5	0.83	0.81	-0.03	0.03	0.40	0.11
SAT. 6	0.81	0.71	-0.22	-0.09	0.49	0.09
SAT. 7	0.65	-0.76	-0.14	0.14	-0.19	-0.04
SAT. 8	0.52	-0.19	0.02	-0.05	-0.69	0.04
SAT. 9	0.55	-0.23	-0.16	0.55	-0.41	0.01
SAT. 10	0.73	-0.54	0.57	-0.20	-0.20	0.18
SAT. 11	0.87	0.90	-0.23	0.11	0.05	0.02
SAT. 12	0.77	0.47	-0.32	-0.23	0.61	0.13
SAT. 13	0.78	0.78	-0.38	-0.12	0.12	0.00
SAT. 14	0.78	0.69	-0.24	-0.29	0.40	-0.11
SAT. 15	0.57	-0.02	0.05	0.74	0.07	0.12
SAT. 16	0.62	-0.07	0.75	0.17	0.09	-0.13
SAT. 17	0.66	0.51	-0.23	-0.36	0.04	0.46
SAT. 18	0.67	0.29	-0.40	-0.06	0.23	0.61
SAT. 19	0.79	0.81	0.06	-0.02	0.16	0.32
SAT. 20	0.81	0.63	0.11	-0.04	0.63	0.09
SAT. 21	0.29	-0.04	0.10	0.51	-0.01	-0.14
SAT. 22	0.59	-0.25	0.71	0.01	0.12	-0.12
SAT. 23	0.80	-0.22	-0.27	0.69	-0.03	-0.44
SAT. 24	0.57	-0.06	0.64	-0.09	-0.31	-0.23
SAT. 25	0.52	0.27	-0.02	0.43	0.48	0.17
SAT. 26	0.58	0.34	0.54	-0.11	0.30	0.26
SAT. 27	0.66	-0.30	-0.18	0.72	-0.12	0.10
SAT. 28	0.70	-0.07	0.79	-0.25	-0.10	0.09
Percent of Common Variance						
	100.0	50.7	22.1	15.3	6.8	5.1
Percent of Total Variance						
	73.9	35.5	16.3	11.8	5.7	4.6

4) The items included in any factor should fit logically into that factor.
5) Factors should be subject to meaningful interpretation.

Given these rules, the following procedures were carried out.

Satisfaction items 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14 and 19 were included in Factor One. Since the items had a connotation of collegiality and supportiveness, especially items 11, 5 and 19 which had the highest loadings of 0.89, 0.81 and 0.81 respectively, on the factor, the first factor was labelled Supervisory Supportiveness. A summary of the items included in Factor One, their descriptive statements and their loadings on this factor are presented in Table 34.

Satisfaction items 2, 16, 22, 24, 26 and 28 were included in Factor Two. Items 2 and 28 had very high loadings of 0.81 and 0.79 respectively on this factor. Consequently, the second factor was labelled Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback (see summary in Table 35).

Items 1, 15 and 27 were considered for inclusion in Factor Three. All three items had very high loadings on the factor with item 1 having the highest loading of 0.82. Since two of the three items had an interactional connotation pertaining to supervisory feedback sessions, the third factor was labelled Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions. The items included in this factor are summarized in Table 36.

The fourth and fifth factors were excluded from

TABLE 34

Items Included in Factor One:
Supervisory Supportiveness

Variable (Item) Number	Statement	Factor Loading
SAT.* 3	My self-confidence as a teacher has been lowered as a result of the feedback session.	-0.72
SAT. 5	I appreciated the supportive spirit evident in the feedback sessions.	0.81
SAT. 7	I felt threatened by the feedback sessions.	-0.76
SAT. 11	I felt that my supervisor treated me as a colleague.	0.89
SAT. 13	My supervisor conferred with me briefly after each lesson to discuss my teaching experience of that particular lesson.	0.78
SAT. 14	I was satisfied with the way my supervisor observed and collected data for the feedback sessions.	0.69
SAT. 19	I felt that I was given enough time for feedback by my supervisor.	0.81

*Refers to item number on the Satisfaction Questionnaire.

TABLE 35

Items Included in Factor Two: Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback

Variable (Item) Number	Statement	Factor Loading
SAT.* 2	I feel satisfied that I can now perform better as a teacher due to the feedback I received during supervisory feedback sessions.	0.81
SAT. 16	I liked only positive remarks regarding my classroom teaching during feedback sessions.	0.75
SAT. 22	I felt that the supervisor was genuinely concerned about helping me during the feedback sessions.	0.71
SAT. 24	I regarded the supervisory skills of my supervisor as effective.	0.64
SAT. 26	I appreciated the planned follow-up guidance by my supervisor after the student teaching.	0.54
SAT. 28	I had adequate feedback from my supervisor this last student teaching period.	0.79

*Refers to item number on the Satisfaction Questionnaire.

TABLE 36

Items Included in Factor Three: Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions

Variable (Item) Number		Statement	Factor Loading
SAT.*	1	If I could go back in time and have another round of student teaching, I would like to receive supervisory feedback in the same way.	0.82
SAT.	15	My supervisor prepared carefully for the feedback session.	0.74
SAT.	27	My supervisor gave concrete examples from the observations of my teaching performance to illustrate areas of strength and weakness in my teaching.	0.72

*Refers to item number on the Satisfaction Questionnaire.

further analysis because the items that loaded on them did not satisfy some or all of the decision rules listed earlier.

The analysis of data was carried out in terms of the three factors in order to address the third research question and its sub-problems as described below.

The mean satisfaction scores on each of the three factors were expressed in terms of supervisory supportiveness (Factor 1) scores, Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback (Factor 2) scores and Quality of Interaction in Feedback Session (Factor 3) scores. The results of the analysis for each of the three factors are presented below.

Satisfaction with Supervisory Supportiveness

The range of mean supervisory supportiveness scores in each of the five schools is presented in Table 37. Inspection of Table 37 reveals that all four faculty consultants had mean scores between the range of 3.50 to 4.00. The range of supervisory supportiveness scores for cooperating teachers was wider. Each of the five schools had at least one cooperating teacher with a higher supportiveness score than the faculty consultant, whereas four of the five schools had at least one cooperating teacher with a lower supportiveness score than the faculty consultant.

Discussion. These data can be interpreted as follows: the student teachers were satisfied with the supportiveness of the faculty consultants and all the four

TABLE 37

Comparison of Supervisory Supportiveness Scores* Between Schools

School \ Mean Score	Range of Satisfaction Score							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1				✓		x	✓	
2			✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓
3				✓	✓ ✓	x	✓	
4						x ✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓
5		✓				x ✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓

* The higher the score the better

x Faculty Consultant (N = 4)

✓ Cooperating Teacher (N = 22)

faculty consultants in the five schools were perceived as more or less similar in their supportiveness by the student teachers. Furthermore, although student teachers were satisfied with the supportiveness of the faculty consultants, there was at least one cooperating teacher in each school with whose supportiveness the student teachers were more satisfied than with that of the faculty consultant. For example, schools 1 and 3 each had one cooperating teacher with a higher supportiveness score than the faculty consultants; school 2 had two cooperating teachers within a higher supportiveness score than the faculty consultant; and schools 4 and 5 had two cooperating teachers within the same range of supportiveness score as the faculty consultant and three cooperating teachers with higher supportiveness scores than the faculty consultant. Schools 2, 4 and 5 each had one cooperating teacher whose supportiveness score fell within the highest overall range.

In general, one can conclude, on the basis of the data presented in Table 37, that the student teachers appeared to be most satisfied with the supervisory supportiveness rendered by the faculty consultant and cooperating teachers in school 4 since it is the single school where all the supervisors fell within the high satisfaction score range of between 3.50 and 5.00.

Similarly, the satisfaction of student teachers with the supervisory supportiveness in school 5 was mainly from the three cooperating teachers who had higher scores than the faculty consultant. School 5, unlike school 4, however, had one cooperating teacher not only with a low supportiveness score, but also within the lowest range of supportiveness score overall.

Satisfaction with Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback

The range of Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback scores is presented in Table 38. Unlike supervisory supportiveness in which student teachers perceived all the four faculty consultants more or less similarly, Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback scores revealed a slight change in perception of student teachers. Faculty consultants in schools 1, 2 and 3 still had a mean score within the range of 3.50 to 4.00. Faculty consultants in schools 4 and 5, however, had a lower mean score on Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback than they had on supportiveness. Furthermore, the faculty consultant in school 5 fell not only within a lower range of scores than his previous supportiveness score, but also within the low satisfaction range.

Discussion. Once again, each of the five schools had at least one cooperating teacher with not only a high adequacy of supervisory feedback score but also within a higher range of scores than the faculty consultant in the same school, indicating, to some extent a higher degree of student teachers' satisfaction with adequacy of feedback of one or more cooperating teachers than that of the faculty

TABLE 38

Comparison of Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback Scores* Between Schools

Mean Score / School	Range of Satisfaction Scores							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1				✓		x		✓
2			✓	✓ ✓	✓	x	✓	
3		✓			✓	x ✓		✓
4					x ✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓	
5				x ✓ ✓		✓ ✓ ✓	✓	

* The higher the score the better

x Faculty Consultant (N = 4)

✓ Cooperating Teacher (N = 22)

consultant in the same school.

Satisfaction with Quality of Interaction

Inspection of the range of Quality of Interaction scores, shown in Table 39, indicates that the student teachers were satisfied with the interactional aspects of the supervisory sessions led by faculty consultants. The faculty consultant in school 4, however, had the highest score on the quality of interaction factor. In the same school, all the supervisors had high satisfaction scores with two cooperating teachers not only falling within the highest satisfaction range but also having higher satisfaction scores on this factor than the faculty consultant.

Discussion. It is clear from the data presented in Tables 37, 38 and 39 that in any given school, the satisfaction scores assigned to supervisors ranged widely. Again the supervisors in school 4 were rated most highly. The cooperating teachers also tended to be more favourably rated than the faculty consultants.

Between School Differences in Satisfaction Scores

Analysis of variance was carried out on the satisfaction scores of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers school by school, all weeks combined, to determine if there were any significant differences in the supervisory satisfaction scores between any two schools.

TABLE 39

Comparison of Quality of Interaction Scores* Between Schools

Mean Score / School	Range of Satisfaction Score							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1		✓				x ✓		
2			✓	✓ ✓		x ✓	✓	
3		✓		✓		x ✓		✓
4						✓ ✓ ✓	x	✓ ✓
5				✓		x ✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓

* The higher the score the better
x Faculty Consultant (N = 4)
✓ Cooperating Teacher (N = 22)

Inspection of the results of the F-tests on the supervisory supportiveness, adequacy of supervisory feedback and quality of interaction in feedback session scores revealed that no two schools were significantly different at the .01 level in their satisfaction scores on all the three factors. In other words, the numerical differences in satisfaction scores of supervisors in the individual schools discussed under question 3 did not contribute to any statistically significant differences in overall satisfaction scores between any two schools. The F-test results are included in Appendix J.

Helpfulness of Feedback Sessions

The student teachers were asked to indicate, on a five-point scale, ranging from Not at All (1) to A Great Deal (5), the extent to which the supervisory feedback during the student teaching period was helpful in enhancing the teaching behaviors listed under item 29 on part B of the Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The results of the analyses of the data for item 29 are presented in Table 40. Inspection of Table 40 suggests that the cooperating teachers' feedback was more helpful than the feedback from faculty consultants in enhancing all but two of the ten teaching behaviors. Perhaps the closer working relationship, on a daily basis, between the cooperating teachers and the student teachers accounted for the fact that the student teachers rated the cooperating teachers

TABLE 40

Comparison of Helpfulness of Supervisory Feedback in Enhancing Selected Teaching Practices

Variable	Range of Scores							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1. General growth and maturity					x	✓		
2. Better rapport with the children				x	✓			
3. Better rapport with your cooperating teacher				x		✓		
4. More varied approaches to teaching					x	✓		
5. Greater ease and confidence in the classroom						x	✓	
6. Discipline in the classroom				x		✓		
7. Specific children's academic progress or problems				x		✓		
8. Integration of theory and practice				✓ x				
9. Personal or emotional problems			x	✓				
10. Better rapport with your faculty consultant			✓		x			

x = Faculty Consultant ✓ = Cooperating Teacher higher in these areas. The faculty consultants had a higher score than the cooperating teachers on only one of the ten areas, that is, establishing better rapport with the faculty consultant.

Suitability of Locations

Item 32 on the Satisfaction Questionnaire was designed to elicit responses pertaining to the extent to which various locations were used for holding supervisory feedback sessions. A related item requested the respondents to express their degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of the various locations (see item 33 on the Satisfaction Questionnaire).

In response to item 32, the respondents indicated how often the place settings listed and "other" were used for supervisory feedback sessions on a five-point scale ranging from Never (1) to Always (5).

A comparison of the mean scores shown on Table 41 indicates that the classroom was the single most frequently used place for supervisory feedback sessions. The cooperating teachers, however, used the classroom much more often ($\overline{X}$ = 4.00-4.50) than did the faculty consultants ($\overline{X}$ = 2.50-3.00). The staffroom was used slightly more frequently than the hallway, the school library, the art room and any other empty classrooms which were either rarely used or not used at all. The faculty consultants, however, used private offices more often than the cooperating teachers did.

TABLE 41

Comparison of the Use of Various Locations for Holding Supervisory Feedback Sessions

Locations	Range of Scores							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1. Staff Room			x ✓					
2. Classroom				x			✓	
3. Hallway	x	✓						
4. Private Office	✓		x					
5. School Library	x ✓							
6. Others:								
a) Art Room	✓	x						
b) Empty Classroom	x ✓							

x = Faculty Consultant

✓ = Cooperating Teacher

In response to item 33 on the Satisfaction Questionnaire, the respondents indicated on a five-point scale ranging from Unsatisfactory (1) to Highly Satisfactory (5) the suitability of the place settings above for holding feedback sessions. The range of satisfaction scores is presented in Table 42. The staffroom, which was one of the more frequently used places for supervisory feedback sessions (Table 41) provided the least satisfactory atmosphere for supervisory feedback sessions. The staffroom was unsuitable for the sessions because, as one of the student teachers explained, "There was always someone else eavesdropping and receiving the feedback with you. This could be the principal, other teachers, the secretary and fellow student teachers. Who wants to be exposed this way?"

The classroom, which was one of the most used places for the feedback sessions, was on the other hand, also one of the most satisfactory places for the sessions. Private offices, however, got the highest rating for its suitability for holding the sessions. These two locations provided the most privacy and were therefore perceived as most suitable for holding such sessions.

Other Preferred Locations

Responses to this item were meant to indicate places, other than those listed in items 32 and 33 on the Satisfaction Questionnaire where the student teachers would have preferred to hold satisfactory feedback sessions. The

TABLE 42

Comparison of the Suitability of the Locations used for Holding Supervisory Feedback Sessions

Locations	Range of Satisfaction Score							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1. Staff Room				x ✓				
2. Classroom						x	✓	
3. Hallway				✓	x			
4. Private Office								x ✓
5. School Library				✓		x		
6. Others:								
a) Art Room						x		
b) Empty Classroom								x

x = Faculty Consultant

✓ = Cooperating Teacher

general consensus of the respondents was that "any place where absolute privacy was ensured and the atmosphere of which was not threatening, would be just fine . . . ." The respondents had additional comments to this item to the effect that "regardless of the time of day, the staffroom was the least suitable place for holding feedback sessions as is the hallway . . . . It is hard to hear anything while on the move."

Content Analysis of Open-ended Items

The open ended items on Part B of the Satisfaction Questionnaire were meant to elicit responses pertaining to ways, other than those listed earlier, in which supervisory feedback was helpful to the student teachers (item 30), other ways in which supervisory feedback would have been helpful to the student teacher but was not (item 31) and general or overall impression of the student teachers with supervisory feedback sessions over the entire student teaching period (item 35).

Results of a content analysis of the responses to these items suggested that supervisory feedback was helpful in building up the student teachers' self-confidence, in enhancing the student teachers' understanding of basic philosophical issues about teaching, in encouraging the student teachers to gain and learn from working together with experienced supervisors, especially cooperating teachers, in making the student teachers aware of their progress on an ongoing basis and in eliminating the threats associated with progress assessment by maintaining casual, informal settings, for the feedback sessions. It was, however, realized that there were some areas in which supervisory feedback was not as helpful as the student teachers would have liked or expected it to be.

There was dissatisfaction on the part of the student teachers with the poor timing of the feedback sessions, inadequacy of feedback received, inadequacy of the frequency of visitations and/or observations made by the supervisors, inadequate matching of student teachers' personality with the personality of the supervisors, lack of provision of constructive specific and concrete feedback, and lack of consensus or precision regarding various procedures for evaluating student teachers. General impressions of the student teachers included their appreciation or lack of appreciation of the set up and value of the feedback session, their reactions to the research and their general concerns with the evaluation procedures employed during the student teaching period. The details of the content analysis are included in Appendix K.

CHAPTER 8

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: RELATING EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK TO SATISFACTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

The analyses of the data in this chapter is performed in order to address research question 4. This research question sought to investigate the extent to which the rated effectiveness of supervisory processes (findings for research question 1) was related to the satisfaction of student teachers with supervisory practices during the feedback sessions (research question 3).

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

"Was there any discernible relationship between rated effectiveness of supervisory practices (research question 1) and satisfaction of student teachers (research question 3)?"

The three factors generated from the 28 items in Part A of the Satisfaction Questionnaire were used in a regression analysis to determine the best predictors of the criterion variable, overall effectiveness of supervisory processes. The three factors are discussed in Chapter 7 whereas the supervisory effectiveness scores are included in Chapter 5.

The results of this analysis showing the three predictor variables (factors) along with the Multiple R and R Square or coefficient of determination are summarized in Table 43 for faculty consultants and Table 44 for cooperating teachers. Table 45 shows the correlation coefficients for each of the factors for faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. The results of the data presented on Tables 43, 44 and 45 can be summarized in terms of the following observations:

1. The best predictor of overall supervisory effectiveness was supervisory supportiveness which was associated with 29 percent of the variance in overall effectiveness of faculty consultants and 62 percent of the variance in overall effectiveness of cooperating teachers.

2. Supervisory supportiveness and adequacy of supervisory feedback in combination accounted for 65 percent of variance in the overall effectiveness of cooperating teachers. Supervisory supportiveness in combination with quality of interaction in feedback sessions accounted for only 30 percent of variance in the overall effectiveness of faculty consultants.

3. The three factors were all significant predictor variables, as indicated by a p = beyond .001 (Table 45), of overall effectiveness of cooperating teachers accounting for 65 percent of variance in combination.

4. Overall, supervisory supportiveness was found to be a strong predictor of supervisory effectiveness in both cases, but more so for cooperating teachers.

TABLE 43

A Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Relating Faculty Consultants' Supervisory Effectiveness* and Student Teachers' Satisfaction

Variable	Multiple R	R Square
Factor 1 Supervisory Supportiveness	0.54	0.29 -- % of variance accounted for by Factor 1 alone.
Factor 3 Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions	0.55	0.30 -- % of variance accounted for by Factors 1 and 3 combined.
Factor 2 Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback	0.55	0.30 -- % of variance accounted for by Factors 1, 2, and 3 together i.e. & of total variance.

*Dependent Variable = Faculty Consultants' average Effectiveness Scores on the 15 items of the Feedback Analysis Form (Research Question 1)

TABLE 44

A Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Relating Cooperating Teachers' Supervisory Effectiveness* and Student Teachers' Satisfaction

Variable	Multiple R	R Square
Factor 1 Supervisory Supportiveness	0.79	0.62 -- % of variance accounted for by Factor 1 alone.
Factor 2 Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback	0.81	0.65 -- % of variance accounted for by factors 1 and 2 combined.
Factor 3 Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions	0.81	0.65 -- % of variance accounted for by factors 1, 2, and 3 together, i.e. % of total variance.

*Dependent Variable - Cooperating Teachers' average Effectiveness Scores on the 15 items of the Feedback Analysis Form (Research Question 1).

TABLE 45

A Comparison of the Correlations Between the Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores for Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers

Variable	Faculty Consultants' Process	Cooperating Teachers' Process
Factor 1 Supervisory Supportiveness	*-0.54 p = 0.005	-0.80 beyond 0.001
Factor 2 Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback	-0.34 p = 0.59	-0.70 beyond 0.001
Factor 3 Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions	-0.45 p = 0.019	-0.68 beyond 0.001

*The negative correlations are as a result of the reversed order of interpreting the two groups of scores. For the Effectiveness Scores, the lower the score the better or the more effective the supervisor. For the Satisfaction Scores, the higher the score the better or more satisfied the student teachers.

CHAPTER 9

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: RELATING OVERALL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE TO PATTERNS OF DISCUSSION OF THE TOPICS

The results of the analysis of the data are presented in this chapter in relation to research question 5. The relationships between overall supervisory effectiveness and the pattern of discussion of the topics are explored. The pattern of discussion of the topics is discussed with regards to the seven sub-problems listed with research question 2 on pages 8 and 9 of this report.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5

"Were there any discernible patterns between the topic areas discussed by the more effective supervisors and those discussed by the less effective supervisors?"

The Analyses of the data for research question 5 are presented in three parts. First, the procedures for determining overall supervisory scores are discussed. Second, an outline is provided for grouping the supervisors into the More Effective and the Less Effective categories. Third, a comparison is made in the pattern of discussion of the topics between the supervisors who had higher ratings for their overall performance -- the more effective supervisors -- and those who had lower ratings for the same -- the less effective supervisors.

Determining Overall Supervisory Scores

The average supervisory effectiveness and satisfaction scores were computed from the results of the analyses provided for research questions 1 and 3 respectively.

Each supervisor was assigned an average effectiveness score by averaging the mean scores on the 15 Feedback Analysis Form items. At the same time, an average satisfaction score was given each supervisor by averaging the mean scores for each of the three factors generated from the 28 items in Part A of the Satisfaction Questionnaire - supervisory supportiveness, adequacy of supervisory feedback and quality of interaction in feedback sessions.

The resulting average score from the two sets of scores mentioned above -- effectiveness and satisfaction -- was the overall supervisory score. The figures for such scores as well as the distribution of the scores in each of the five schools are provided in Appendix L.

Grouping the Supervisors

A list showing the overall supervisory scores for each supervisor was generated from the figures included in Appendix L.

The faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were categorized into More Effective and Less Effective supervisors based on their position in the rank-ordered list of overall supervisory scores as shown in Table 46.

The designation of the supervisors for whom substance data were available from the number of observations made of their feedback sessions was also included in Table 46. The dividing line between the more effective and the less effective supervisors was mid-way the list presented in Table 46. Consequently, the upper half of supervisors (11 cooperating teachers and 2 faculty consultants) were included in the more effective category and the lower half supervisors (also 11 cooperating teachers and 2 faculty consultants) were included in the less effective category.

A total of 19 observations were made for the more effective supervisors and 11 observations for the less effective supervisors. The number of observations made for each supervisor depended entirely on the availability of the participants in the feedback sessions and suitability of observation time.

Based on the two categories shown in Table 46, a comparative description of the substance of supervisory feedback was therefore made in reference to overall frequency of occurrence of the topics, frequency of occurrence of the topics per session, time spent on the topics, pattern of initiation of topics between supervisors and student teachers, topics with which supervisory sessions started out, sequence of occurrence of the topics, and topics with which supervisory sessions ended.

TABLE 46

Rank Order of Overall Supervisory Scores

	Rank	Supervisor/ School	Total Effectiveness Score (6-1)	Total Student Satisfaction Score (5-1)	Overall Supervisory Score	No. of Observations*
More Effective Supervisors	1	CT 3	5.60	4.53	4.80	1
	2	CT 5	5.37	4.48	4.70	-
	3	CT 4	5.27	4.48	4.68	1
	4	CT 4	5.13	4.47	4.63	1
	5	CT 1	5.82	4.20	4.60	1
	6	CT 2	5.58	4.26	4.59	-
	7	CT 5	5.05	4.26	4.46	-
	8	CT 5	4.75	4.25	4.37	1
	9	CT 4	5.05	4.09	4.33	1
	10	CT 2	5.58	3.81	4.26	-
	11	FC 1,2	4.60	3.97	4.13	11
	12	CT 3	5.12	3.70	4.05	-
	13	FC 4	4.79	3.77	4.03	2
					Total	19
Less Effective Supervisors	14	CT 4	5.68	3.47	4.02	1
	15	FC 3	4.63	3.79	4.00	4
	16	CT 5	4.38	3.85	3.98	-
	17	CT 4	4.87	3.52	3.86	1
	18	CT 5	4.81	3.52	3.85	-
	19	FC 5	4.92	3.50	3.75	3
	20	CT 2	4.48	3.04	3.40	-
	21	CT 3	3.91	3.20	3.38	-
	22	CT 2	3.93	2.66	2.98	-
	23	CT 1	4.18	2.50	2.92	1
	24	CT 3	4.35	2.17	2.72	-
	25	CT 5	3.18	2.56	2.71	1
	26	CT 2	3.07	2.50	2.64	-
					Total	11

* denotes number of times observation of the feedback sessions were made. Also indicates number of Post-Observation Conference Checklists completed for each supervisor.

Frequency of Occurrence of the Topics

Percent of occurrence of the topics in supervisory sessions led by the more effective and the less effective supervisors is presented in Table 47. Marked differences were noticed between the two sessions in the occurrence of presentation of lesson and content of lesson and, to a smaller extent, "other" topics and discipline.

A general observation of the figures on the last column of Table 47 suggests that the more effective supervisors had a higher frequency of occurrence of presentation of lesson by 10.3%, content of lesson, by 10.0%, review of performance, by 2.5%, and instructional planning by 1.8%. The less effective supervisors had a higher frequency of occurrence of "other" topics by 8.8%, discipline by 5.9%, quality of interpersonal relationship by 3.7%, personal qualities by 2.9%, classroom management by 1.8%, and informal conversation by 1.4%.

Discussion. Apparently, the more effective supervisors talked about topics related to actual teaching and pupil learning more often than the less effective supervisors. The less effective supervisors, on the other hand, discussed person (student-teacher) oriented topics more often than the more effective supervisors. The less effective supervisors also discussed more topics more often than their more effective counterparts, suggesting that possibly the less effective supervisors "overloaded" the

TABLE 47

Comparison of Occurrence of the Topics in the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions

Topic Areas	More Effective Supervisors (N = 19)		Less Effective Supervisors (N = 11)		Total		Difference
	f	%	f	%	f	%	%
1. Presentation of Lesson	34	26.0	21	15.7	55	20.8	+10.0
2. Classroom Management	29	22.1	32	23.9	61	23.0	- 1.8
3. Content of Lesson	19	14.5	6	4.5	25	9.4	+10.0
4. Instructional Planning	16	12.2	14	10.4	30	11.3	+ 1.8
5. Review of Performance	16	12.2	13	9.7	19	10.9	+ 2.5
6. Others	6	4.6	18	13.4	24	9.1	- 8.8
7. Discipline	5	3.8	13	9.7	18	6.8	- 5.9
8. Personal Qualities	3	2.3	7	5.2	10	3.8	- 2.9
9. Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	2	1.5	7	5.2	9	3.4	- 3.7
10. Informal Conversation	1	0.8	3	2.2	4	1.5	- 1.4
Total	131	100.0	134	100.0	265	100.0	-

student teachers with feedback especially encompassing the student teachers' personal qualities and other person-oriented topics.

Frequency of Occurrence of the Topics per Session

On Table 48, a summary of the average number of topics that occurred per each supervisory session is given for the more effective supervisors, the less effective supervisors and for the total sample. The average number of topics occurring in faculty consultants' sessions and cooperating teachers' sessions are also included on the same Table 48 as discussed earlier on page 161 of the report.

In the supervisory sessions led by the more effective supervisors, the cooperating teachers used more topics (5.50) per session than the faculty consultants (3.23). In the sessions led by the less effective supervisors however, the faculty consultants used more topics (6.00) per session than the cooperating teachers (5.50).

Inspection of the figures for the average number of topics used by both the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers indicate that the more effective supervisors used an average of 3.95 topics per session whereas the less effective supervisors used an average of 5.82 topics per session.

Discussion. More effective cooperating teachers tended to discuss more topics per session than did the more

TABLE 48

Average Number of Topics That Occurred Per Session

Supervisor	More Effective (N = 19)	Less Effective (N = 11)	Total Sample
Faculty Consultant	3.23	6.00	4.20
Cooperating Teacher	5.50	5.50	5.45
Both	3.95	5.82	4.65

effective faculty consultants. Less effective faculty consultants and both the more effective and the less effective cooperating teachers however, had tendencies towards "overloading" their supervisory sessions. An average of about four topics would appear to be ideal for one supervisory session (See Kyte's first suggestion on p. 39). Attempts to use more than four to five topics per session may suggest an "overload" in a supervisory feedback session.

Time Spent on Topics

Table 49 shows a summary of the percent of time spent on each topic in supervisory sessions led by the more effective supervisors and the sessions led by the less effective supervisors.

The more effective supervisors spent about six times as much total time (34.5 minutes) as the less effective supervisors (5.5 minutes) discussing content of lesson and almost twice as much time (40.0 minutes) as the less effective supervisors (20.0 minutes) discussing instructional planning, presentation of lesson (more effective 59.5 minutes; less effective 38.5 minutes) and review of performance (more effective 13.0 minutes; less effective 7.0 minutes).

The less effective supervisors, on the other hand, spent almost eight times as much time (16.0 minutes) as the more effective supervisors (2.5 minutes) did on personal qualities (1.5 minutes), over five times as much time (8.5

TABLE 49

Comparison of Percent of Time Spent on Each Topic in the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions

Topic Areas	More Effective (N = 19)		Less Effective (N = 11)		Difference
	Total Time	%	Total Time	%	%
1. Classroom Management	62.5	26.3	56.5	28.8	-7.1
2. Presentation of Lesson	59.5	25.7	38.5	19.6	+6.1
3. Instructional Planning	40.0	17.3	20.0	10.2	+7.1
4. Content of Lesson	34.5	14.9	5.5	2.8	+12.1
5. Discipline	13.0	5.6	23.0	11.7	-6.1
6. Review of Performance	13.0	5.6	7.0	3.6	+2.0
7. Others	5.5	2.4	18.5	9.4	-3.9
8. Personal Qualities	2.5	1.1	16.0	8.2	-7.1
9. Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	1.5	0.6	8.5	4.3	-3.7
10. Informal Conversation	1.0	0.4	2.5	1.3	-0.9
Total	231.5	199.9	196.0	100.0	-

minutes) as the more effective supervisors (1.5 minutes) did on quality of interpersonal relationship, almost twice as much time (23.0 minutes) as the more effective supervisors (13.0 minutes) on discipline, three times as much time (18.5 minutes) as the more effective supervisors (5.5 minutes) on "other" topics and over two times as much time (2.5 minutes) as the more effective supervisors (1.0 minutes) on informal conversation.

Discussion. Generally, the more effective supervisors spent a higher percentage of their time on instructional planning (+7.1%), content of lesson (+12.1%), presentation of lesson (+6.1%), and review of performance (+2.0%), all of which were more directly related to teaching performance and pupil learning.

The less effective supervisors tended to spend a greater percentage of their time on the more person-oriented topics like personal qualities (-7.1%), quality of interpersonal relationship (-3.7%), discipline (-6.1%), informal conversation (0.9%), the "other" topics (-3.9%), and to a lesser extent classroom management (-1.5%). Some of these topics also seem to involve the less effective supervisors' exercise of some form of control or discipline in an authoritarian sense on the student teachers performance.

Pattern of Initiation of Topics

The percent of initiation of individual topics between the supervisors and student teachers in sessions led by the more effective supervisors and those led by the less effective supervisors are shown on Table 50.

Generally, a consideration of the differences in initiation of individual topics between the supervisors and student teachers (Table 50) suggests that the more effective supervisors tended to initiate informal conversation, personal qualities and instructional planning more often than the less effective supervisors by +66.7%, +14.3% and +8.9% respectively. The less effective supervisors, on the other hand, tended to initiate quality of interpersonal relationship, review of performance, content of lesson, discipline, presentation of lesson, and classroom management more often (-35.7%; -14.4%; -9.6%; -6.2%; -4.9% and -1.4% respectively) than the more effective supervisors.

The student teachers in the more effective supervisory sessions tended to initiate discipline (+21.5%), content of lesson (+21.1%), other topics (+5.5%) and presentation of lesson (+1.6%) more than the student teachers in the less effective supervisory sessions. The student teachers in the less effective supervisory sessions, however, tended to initiate informal conversation (-66.7%), classroom management (-14.3%), review of performance (-4.3%) and instructional planning (-1.8%) more than their counterparts in the more effective supervisory sessions.

The more effective supervisors and the student teachers both initiated quality of interpersonal relationship (+35.7%), review of performance (+18.8%), and class-

TABLE 50

Comparison of Initiation of Topics by Supervisors and Student Teachers Between the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions

Topic Areas	More Effective Supervisors (N = 19)								Less Effective Supervisors (N = 11)								Difference		
	Supervisor		Student Teacher		Both		Total		Supervisor Supervisor		Student Teacher		Both Both		Total Total		Supervisor Supervisor	Student Teacher	Both Both
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	%	%	%
1. Personal Qualities	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.3	6	85.7	0	0.0	1	14.8	7	5.2	+14.3	0.0	-14.3
2. Instructional Planning	14	87.5	2	12.5	0	0.0	16	12.2	11	78.6	2	14.3	1	7.4	14	10.4	+8.9	-1.8	-7.1
3. Content of Lesson	14	73.7	4	21.1	1	5.3	19	14.5	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	6	4.5	-9.6	+21.1	-11.4
4. Presentation of Lesson	21	61.8	7	20.6	6	17.6	34	26.0	14	66.7	4	19.0	3	14.3	21	15.7	-4.9	+1.6	+3.3
5. Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	2	1.5	6	5.7	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	5.2	-35.7	0.0	+35.7
6. Classroom Management	15	51.7	4	13.8	10	34.5	29	22.1	17	53.1	9	28.1	6	18.8	32	23.9	-1.4	-14.3	+15.7
7. Discipline	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	5	3.8	6	46.2	5	38.5	2	15.4	13	9.7	-6.2	+21.5	-15.4
8. Review of Performance	10	62.5	3	18.8	3	18.8	16	12.2	10	76.9	3	23.1	0	0.0	13	9.7	-14.4	-4.3	+18.8
9. Informal Conversation	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3	2.2	+66.7	-66.7	0.0
10. Others	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	4.6	9	50.0	5	27.8	4	22.2	18	13.4	0.0	+5.5	-5.5
Total	84	64.1	25	19.1	22	16.8	131	100.0	85	63.4	30	22.4	19	14.2	134	100.0			

room management (+15.7%) more than both the supervisors and the student teachers in the less effective supervisory sessions. Both the supervisors and student teachers in the less effective supervisory sessions, on the other hand, initiated discipline (-15.4%), personal qualities (-14.3%), content of lesson (-11.4%), instructional planning (-7.1%) and other topics (-5.5%) more than both supervisors and student teachers in the more effective supervisory sessions.

As shown on Table 51, the differences in initiation of all the topics together were very small. To a limited extent, the figures on Table 51 indicate that more effective supervisors initiated topics alone (64.1%) or together with the student teachers (16.8%) more often than the less effective supervisors (63.4% and 14.2%). Student teachers in the less effective supervisory sessions tended to initiate topics alone more often (22.4%) than those in more effective supervisory sessions (19.1%).

Discussion. The basic differences in the pattern of initiation of the topics between supervisors and student teachers in the more effective and the less effective supervisory sessions were observed to be more interactional in the less effective supervisory sessions, and supervisor-directed in the more effective supervisory sessions.

Topics with Which Feedback Sessions Started Out

Table 52 shows the frequency and percentage of the

TABLE 51

Comparison of Total Initiation of Topics by the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisors

Initiation of Topics	More Effective N = 19		Less Effective N = 11		Difference
	f	%	f	%	%
Supervisor	84	64.1	85	63.4	+0.7
Student Teacher	25	19.1	30	22.4	-3.3
Both	22	16.8	19	14.2	+2.6
Total	131	100.0	134	100.0	--

TABLE 52

Comparison of the Topics With Which the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions Started Out

Topic Areas	More Effective Supervisors		Less Effective Supervisors		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	-	- -	1	9.1	1	3.3
Instructional Planning	3	15.8	2	18.2	5	16.7
Content of Lesson	2	10.5	1	9.1	3	10.0
Presentation of Lesson	3	15.4	1	9.1	4	13.3
Quality of Inter-personal Relationship	-	- -	-	- -	-	- -
Classroom Management	1	5.3	2	18.2	3	10.0
Discipline	2	10.5	1	9.1	3	10.0
Review of Performance	8	42.1	2	18.2	10	33.3
Informal Conversation	-	- -	-	- -	-	- -
Other Topics	-	- -	-	9.1	1	3.3
Total	19	63.3	11	36.7	30	100.0

topics wich which the more effective and less effective supervisory sessions started out.

The more effective supervisors started out their sessions most frequently with review of performance (42.1%) whereas the less effective supervisors had their pattern of starting out sessions scattered out between review of performance (18.2%), classroom management (18.2%), and instructional planning (18.2%). Personal qualities and other topics were used by only the less effective supervisors to start out their sessions. Quality of interpersonal relationship and informal conversation were not used at all in starting out either of the sessions.

Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics

The frequency and percentage of the sequence of occurrence of the topics is provided in Table 53 for the more effective supervisory sessions and Table 54 for the less effective supervisory sessions.

The figures in Table 53 suggest that the two topics that occurred most frequently as initial and as second topics in the more effective supervisory sessions were presentation of lesson (25.0%; 27.7%) and classroom management (24.1%; 25.0%). In the less effective supervisory sessions (Table 54), the most frequently occurring topic as an initial and second topic was classroom management (25.2%; 24.4%).

In the more effective supervisory sessions (Table 53)

TABLE 53

Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the More Effective Supervisory Sessions

Second Topics	Personal Qualities		Instructional Planning		Content of Lesson		Presentation of Lesson		Quality of Interpersonal Relationship		Classroom Management		Discipline		Review of Performance		Informal Conversation		Other Topics		Total	
Initial Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	2	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2.7
Instructional Planning	-	-	-	-	5	50.0	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10.0	10	8.9
Content of Lesson	-	-	4	21.1	-	-	6	31.6	-	-	6	31.6	-	-	2	10.5	1	5.3	-	-	19	17.0
Presentation of Lesson	1	3.6	7	25.0	1	3.6	12	42.9	1	3.6	12	42.9	-	-	2	7.1	-	-	1	3.6	28	25.0
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	1	50.0	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.8
Classroom Management	1	3.7	2	7.4	3	11.1	15	55.6	-	-	-	-	2	7.4	3	11.1	-	-	1	3.7	27	24.1
Discipline	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	-	-	1	50.0	-	-	-	-	2	1.8
Review of Performance	-	-	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	6	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	20.0	15	13.4
Informal Conversation	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.9
Other Topics	-	-	2	40.0	-	-	1	20.0	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	4.5
Total	3	2.7	13	11.6	17	15.2	31	27.7	2	1,8	28	25.0	3	2.7	8	7.1	1	0.9	6	5.4	112	100.0

TABLE 54

Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics as Initial and Second Topics in the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions

Second Topics	Personal Qualities		Instructional Planning		Content of Lesson		Presentation of Lesson		Quality of Interpersonal Relationship		Classroom Management		Discipline		Review of Performance		Informal Conversation		Other Topics		Total	
Initial Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personal Qualities	-	-	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	5.7
Instructional Planning	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	14.3	-	-	2	14.3	-	-	1	7.1	-	-	9	64.3	14	11.4
Content of Lesson	-	-	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	-	-	1	16.7	6	4.9
Presentation of Lesson	-	-	1	5.9	1	5.9	-	-	2	11.8	5	29.4	2	11.8	3	17.6	-	-	3	17.6	17	13.8
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	2	28.6	-	-	-	-	1	14.3	-	-	4	57.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	5.7
Classroom Management	2	6.5	2	6.5	1	3.2	11	35.5	2	6.5	1	3.2	8	25.8	2	6.5	-	-	2	6.5	31	25.2
Discipline	1	7.7	-	-	-	--	2	15.4	2	15.4	5	38.5	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	13	10.6
Review of Performance	1	9.1	2	18.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	36.4	1	9.1	-	-	2	18.2	1	9.1	11	8.9
Informal Conversation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.8
Other Topics	-	-	5	31.1	1	6.3	2	12.5	-	-	6	37.5	-	-	2	12.5	-	-	-	-	16	13.0
Total	6	4.9	12	9.8	5	4.1	20	16.3	7	5.7	30	24.4	12	9.8	11	8.9	3	2.4	17	13.8	123	100.0

very strong relationships were observed in the sequence of occurrence of presentation of lesson as a second topic to informal conversation (100.0%), presentation of lesson as a second topic to personal qualities (66.7%), and presentation of lesson as second topic to classroom management (55.6%). In the less effective supervisory sessions (Table 54), very strong relationships were only observed for the sequence of occurrence of review of performance as a second topic to informal conversation (100.0%) and in the sequence of occurrence of "other" topics as second topics to instructional planning (64.3%). Other strong links, to a lesser extent were observed in the sequence of occurrence of classroom management as a second topic to personal qualities (42. (42.9%), quality of interpersonal relationship (57.1%), discipline (38.5%), review of performance (36.4%) and "other" topics (37.5%) and, in presentation of lesson as a second topic to classroom management (35.5%) and content of lesson (33.3%).

Discussion. The strength of the links between presentation of lesson and classroom management to subsequent topics in the effective supervisory sessions suggests that the two topics were perhaps perceived by the more effective supervisors as the core to good teaching and as the base upon which rested the nature of performance expected of student teachers in relation to the other topic areas, especially, instructional planning, content of lesson, and general performance.

The less effective supervisors seemed to base their judgements or observations on the sole topic of classroom management in relation, to a much lesser extent, to personal qualities, interpersonal relationship, discipline and other topics. Content of lesson and presentation of lesson was discussed more strongly in relation to presentation of lesson and not as relating to classroom management. The general conclusion to which these observations might lead is the portrayal of the more effective supervisors as capable of encompassing a wider scope of teaching performances and relating them to the two most important contributing factors to actual teaching -- the effectiveness of the lesson presented and the student teachers' ability to manage the class effectively. In other words, the more effective supervisors directed the student teachers' attention to actual teaching performance in relation to two concrete areas of teacher performance.

The less effective supervisors on the other hand, seemed to view the student teachers' performances in terms of personal qualities, maybe implying that some personal characteristics of the student teachers enhanced or inhibited effective teaching.

Despite their different approaches to discussing teaching performance, however, both the more effective and the less effective supervisors tended to identify the contribution to effective teaching of presentation of lesson and classroom management.

Topics with which Supervisory Sessions Ended

The frequency and percentage of the topics with which the more effective and the less effective supervisory sessions ended are presented in Table 55. The more effective supervisors used instructional planning as much (31.6%) as they used presentation of lesson to end their sessions. The frequency of occurrence of the other topics in ending the more effective supervisory sessions were: discipline (15.4%); classroom management (10.5%); review of performance and other topics (5.3%). The more effective supervisors did not use personal qualities, content of lesson, quality of interpersonal relationship and informal conversation to end their sessions. The less effective supervisors used presentation of lesson to end their lessons more frequently (36.4%) than the more effective supervisors (31.6%). The less effective supervisors also used review of performance, informal conversation and other topics equally frequently (18.2%) to end their sessions. Classroom management was the least frequently (9.1%) used topic in ending the less effective supervisory sessions. Personal qualities, instructional planning, content of lesson, interpersonal relationship and discipline were not used at all in ending the less effective supervisory sessions.

Discussion. Whereas supervisory sessions started

TABLE 55

Comparison of the Topics with Which the More Effective and the Less Effective Supervisory Sessions Ended

Topic Areas	More Effective Supervisors		Less Effective Supervisors		Total
	f	%	f	%	%
Personal Qualities	-	---	-	---	---
Instructional Planning	6	31.6	-	---	20.0
Content of Lesson	-	---	-	---	---
Presentation of Lesson	6	31.6	4	36.4	33.3
Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	-	---	-	---	---
Discipline	3	15.4	-	---	10.0
Classroom Management	2	10.5	1	9.1	10.0
Review of Performance	1	5.3	2	18.2	10.0
Informal Conversation	-	---	2	18.2	6.7
Other Topics	1	5.3	2	18.2	10.0
Total	19	63.3	11	36.7	100.0

out most frequently with review of performance as a topic of discussion and as a way of establishing rapport for the discussions, the sessions ended most frequently with a discussion of topics related to presentation of lesson.

Since the contribution of presentation of lesson to effective teaching was previously discussed in relationship to most other topics in the more effective supervisory sessions (see Table 53), there is justification of its use in ending both supervisory sessions as a way of stressing its importance and ensuring that the issues raised during the discussions were well understood by the student teachers. In other words, the fact that presentation of lesson was used most frequently to end either sessions would highlight its importance in relation to the other topics, and perhaps, to student teaching as a whole.

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first section of this chapter contains an overview of the problem and methodology of the study. Conclusions drawn from the findings and implications of these findings for supervisory practices, together with recommendations for future research, are discussed in the second section of the chapter.

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGY

The framework adopted for assessing relationships among the variables emerged from a review of the literature which generally identified some of the negative outcomes of the process of supervising student teachers.

The literature strongly suggested that there was need for research into what happens to the student teacher during the post-observation conferences. Such research would provide useful insight into student teacher and supervisor interaction in supervisory conferences in four major areas. First, research could serve to underline the importance of acceptable principles of effective supervision in providing feedback to student teachers; second, research of this sort would help identify the various topic areas discussed in post-observation conferences and the degree of emphasis placed on each of the topics; third, such studies would reveal the reactions of student teachers to various supervisory conferences; and fourth, they would provide a basis for describing effective and ineffective supervisory feedback in terms of the other three areas of concern.

These four areas of concern provided the framework for stating the problem and for generating relevant research questions.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the characteristics of feedback given by faculty consultants and cooperating teachers to student teachers during a four-week student teaching period with regards to:

a) propositions for effective supervisory feedback practices derived from the literature review;

b) the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions; and

c) the student teachers' overall satisfaction with supervisory feedback.

In order to address this problem, five major research questions and their derivative sub-problems were developed to guide the data collection and analyses.

Instrumentation and Methodology

Three major research instruments were used to gather data for purposes of this study. These were the Feedback

Analysis Form, the Post-Observation Conference Checklist, and the Satisfaction Questionnaire. The steps taken in the development and use of the various instruments included field testing, a training session, factor analysis and pilot testing. The expected and actual returns for each of these instruments are explained in Chapter 4 of the study.

Although a total return of 275 was expected for the three instruments described above, the actual return of 202 (73.5%) usable instruments was considered to be satisfactory for purposes of this study.

The Sample

The study population consisted of student teachers enrolled in the 4th year Plan B program at the University of Alberta (n = 25), their cooperating teachers in four schools operated by the Edmonton Public School Board and one by the Catholic School Board in the City of Edmonton (n = 25), and their faculty consultants (n = 4) from four departments in the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Treatment of the Data

The statistical techniques used to analyze the data included a comparison of mean scores; one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in combination with F-tests and t-tests; Frequency and Percentage Distributions; Factor Analysis; Content Analysis; Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients; and Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis.

Two levels were established for acceptable statistically significant differences between mean scores: the .05 level was set for t-tests and .01 level for F-tests.

Major Findings

The findings are summarized below for each of the five research questions in turn.

Research Question 1

"To what extent did the supervisory practices of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers approach optimal effectiveness according to the 15 dimensions of effective feedback derived from the literature review as perceived by the student teachers?"

The first research question was designed to solicit the student teachers' responses pertaining to the effectiveness of supervisory processes of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. Furthermore, the analysis sought to detect any differences in the performances of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers over the four weeks of student teaching as well as the differences between performances of the two groups of supervisors within each of the five schools.

Results of the analyses indicated that both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were perceived by stude student teachers to employ equally effective supervisory processes as indicated by their mean scores which approached the highest effectiveness score, according to the scale of the Feedback Analysis Form, on almost all of the 15 items.

The results also indicated that both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were fairly consistent in their supervisory processes over the four weeks of student teaching. Significant differences between faculty consultants' and cooperating teachers' supervisory processes on certain items within two of the five schools seemed to result from the kind of rapport that existed between the principal, the cooperating teachers and the student teachers. Such rapport was evident in the type of support the faculty consultants and the researcher received from the staff, principal and student teachers at any given school.

Research Question 2

"What were the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions during the student teaching period?"

The second research question was designed to solicit data related to the topic areas discussed in supervisory feedback sessions during the student teaching period as recorded on the Post-Observation Conference Checklist (Appendix B). The analysis of the data was carried out in relation to seven major sub-problems investigating the actual topics discussed, frequency of occurrence of the topics, average number of topics that occurred per session, the time spent on each topic, pattern of initiation of the topics, the topics with which the sessions started out, the general order of occurrence of the topics, and the topics with which the sessions ended.

All of the ten topic areas -- personal qualities instructional planning, content of lesson, presentation of lesson, quality of interpersonal relationship, classroom management, discipline, review of performance, informal conversation and "other" topics -- formed the basis for discussions in supervisory feedback sessions although with varying degrees of emphasis and frequency of occurrence. Since all the ten topic areas were identified at one time or other in the feedback sessions, each of the ten seems to be perceived as having some relationship to effective student teaching. Given their higher frequency of occurrence some topics -- especially presentation of lesson, classroom management, instructional planning, content of lesson, discipline and quality of interpersonal relationship -- would seem to be more relevant to effective student teaching than any of the other topics.

Presentation of lesson and classroom management were considered to contribute most substantially to effective student teaching because the two topics were found to be those most frequently discussed in both sessions and in terms of their relationship to the rest of the topics. More time was also spent on discussing these topics than on any of the other topics.

On the whole, faculty consultants tended to focus their discussions on topics such as personal qualities, quality of interpersonal relationship, discipline and presentation of lesson to a greater extent than cooperating teachers did. Cooperating teachers, on the other hand, concentrated more on topics such as instructional planning, classroom management, the content of lesson and review of performance. Informal conversation and discussion of topics in the category of "others" were more characteristic of faculty consultants' sessions than they were of sessions led by cooperating teachers. Overall, supervisors tended to be more directive as observed in the higher frequency with which they initiated discussion on most of the topics. The faculty consultants tended to lead the discussions more often than did the cooperating teachers.

The supervisory feedback sessions frequently started with a review of performance. The cooperating teachers used this category twice as often as the faculty consultants did in starting out their sessions. Most supervisory sessions ended with a discussion of presentation of lesson. The faculty consultants, however, used the category almost twice as often as the cooperating teachers did. The cooperating teachers also used instructional planning as frequently as they did presentation of lesson in ending their feedback sessions.

A relationship was also found in the sequence of occurrence of some of the topics. Whereas faculty consultants discussed classroom management in relation to presentation of lesson, discipline and quality of interpersonal relationship, cooperating teachers focused their discussion of classroom management in relation to instructional planning, content of lesson and personal qualities. Discussion of discipline problems led to a consideration of quality of interpersonal relationship, presentation of lesson and personal qualities in faculty consultants' sessions and to classroom management and review of performance in cooperating teachers' sessions.

Research Question 3

"To what extent did the student teachers express satisfaction with supervisory practices in feedback sessions during the entire student teaching period?"

The analysis of data on the student teachers' satisfaction with supervisory practices in feedback sessions during the entire student teaching period was carried out in three major parts comprising several sub-headings. In the first part, a factor analysis generated three factors, namely Supervisory Supportiveness, Adequacy of Supervisory Feedback and Quality of Interaction in Feedback Sessions. The mean scores of supervisors on scales formed on the basis of each of the three factors were expressed in terms of satisfaction scores.

Some cooperating teachers tended to have higher satisfaction scores than the faculty consultants who seemed to cluster within the average range of scores. Statistical analysis (F-tests), however, revealed that numerical differences in satisfaction scores of supervisors within and between schools did not necessarily meet the test of statistical significance in overall supervisor satisfaction scores.

The student teachers were generally satisfied with the supportiveness of the faculty consultants and cooperating teachers and perceived their feedback as adequate. The student teachers were also satisfied with the quality of interaction in the feedback sessions of both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers. However, they tended to rate cooperating teachers more highly than faculty consultants, perhaps because they spent more time together and therefore received more feedback from the former than they did from the latter.

The closer working relationship between cooperating teachers and student teachers might perhaps also explain why the student teachers perceived the cooperating teachers' feedback as more helpful in enhancing desirable teaching behaviors than that of the faculty consultants.

Regarding the place used for holding feedback sessions, the student teachers expressed satisfaction with the classroom setting which was also the most frequently used location, especially by the cooperating teachers. The staffroom and the hallway, which were mostly used by the faculty consultants, were regarded as unsatisfactory by student teachers. These two locations failed to offer privacy which the student teachers viewed as an important element in an effective session. Any location which offers privacy would therefore be more suitable for such sessions.

The content analysis of the open-ended items on the Satisfaction Questionnaire was included in the third part of the analysis and in Appendix K. The supervisory feedback was found to be helpful in building the student teachers' awareness of their progress on an ongoing basis, building the student teachers' self-confidence, enhancing the student teachers' understanding of philosophical issues related to teaching and learning, and encouraging the student teachers to learn from exposure to the abilities of experienced supervisors.

The student teachers, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the apparently poor timing of the feedback sessions, inadequacy of the feedback received due to the limited number of visitations and observations, inadequate attempts at matching supervisor and student teacher personalities, inadequate provision of specific and constructive feedback and inconsistency in evaluation procedures and techniques of providing supervisory feedback.

Research Question 4

"Was there any discernible relationship between rated effectiveness of supervisory practices and satisfaction of student teachers?"

Results of a stepwise multiple regression analysis relating supervisory effectiveness and satisfaction of student teachers indicated that supervisory supportiveness was strongly related to supervisory effectiveness in both faculty consultants' and cooperating teachers' feedback sessions. This relationship was however, much stronger for cooperating teachers than it was for faculty consultants.

Research Question 5

"Were there any discernible patterns between the topic areas discussed by the more effective supervisors and those discussed by the less effective supervisors?"

In the first two parts of the analysis of the research question, overall effectiveness and satisfaction supervisory scores between and within schools were presented in order to clarify the basis for categorizing the supervisors into More Effective and Less Effective categories. The dividing line between the More Effective and the Less Effective categories was the midpoint of the rank-ordered list of twenty-six supervisors.

Analysis of the differences in the substance of supervisory feedback between the two groups of supervisors yielded the following results:

1) the more effective supervisors spent more time talking about topics related to actual teacher performance and pupil learning than the less effective supervisors who invested their time talking about person (student teacher) oriented topics;

2) the more effective faculty consultants discussed

a reasonable number of topics in each supervisory session whereas the less effective faculty consultants tended to "overload" their sessions by discussing more topics per session;

3) both the more effective and the less effective cooperating teachers tended towards overloading their feedback sessions;

4) the more effective supervisors tended towards being more interactional in their discussions than the less effective supervisors who tended to dominate most of the discussions with the student teachers;

5) in the more effective supervisory sessions strong links were observed between presentation of lesson and classroom management with the rest of the topics, whereas in the less effective supervisory sessions the single topic, classroom management, was overly discussed in relation to the other topics;

6) the more effective supervisors' sessions started out with a discussion of review of performance and ended with a mention of instructional planning and presentation of lesson whereas the less effective supervisors sporadically used review of performance, classroom management and instructional planning to start out their sessions, and presentation of lesson to end their sessions.

Generally, both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were perceived by student teachers to be effective supervisors. Their scores however varied widely depending on the variables investigated by research questions and subproblems. The cooperating teachers seemed to have higher scores in more variables than faculty consultants.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

The general conclusions of the study based on the findings are summarized in the first section of this chapter followed by a synthesis, where possible, of those conclusions which appear to relate to the general literature reviewed in Chapter 2 of this report. The implications which emerge from the findings together with recommendations for future research and supervisory practices are also developed.

Conclusions

The main conclusions drawn from the findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. Generally, both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers were perceived by student teachers to be effective in their supervisory practices according to the various propositions of effective supervision presented in the literature review (Cogan, 1961; Kyte, 1962; Amidon, Kies and Palisi, 1966; Goldhammer, 1969; Mosher and Purpel, 1972; Joyce, 1967; Main, 1972; Fuller and Manning, 1973; Blumberg, 1974; Hyman, 1975; Tuckman, 1976; Education Practicum Handbook, 1979).

The supervisory feedback was perceived as both adequate and inadequate depending on the student teachers' areas of concern. Supervisors appear to have been adequately prepared to perform certain supervisory functions and yet inadequately equipped in certain areas which were important for the development of the teachers towards becoming effective teachers.

The areas that were least satisfying included lack of adequate visitation and other time for performing satisfactory supervisory functions especially for faculty consultants; lack of adequate knowledge on the part of the supervisors regarding which supervisory functions would enhance the student teachers' growth as future teachers and which ones would inhibit the growth. There was also some concern that more effective and uniform approaches to evaluation (formal and informal) in the assessment of the student teachers' progress be established.

2. All of the ten topics listed in the Post-Observation Conference Checklist were discussed with varying degrees of emphasis in the feedback sessions.

Classroom management and presentation of lesson seemed to be topics of discussion much more frequently, suggesting that the two topics may contribute significantly to effective teaching. Classroom management and presentation of lesson also had the most supervisory time spent on them and occurred most frequently as first and second topics of discussion in the feedback sessions. The discussion of the remaining topics seemed to revolve around these two topics, again suggesting their importance in successful teaching. The topics which were also discussed frequently were review of performance, instructional planning and content of lesson.

Perhaps this observation suggests that generally, as cited in the literature review, some priority should be given to topics of discussion in supervisory feedback sessions based on the principles of saliency, treatability and fewness (Goldhammer, 1969). Moreover, there is need to establish an acceptable logical procedure for discussing topics as outlined by Kyte (1962:168) in Chapter 2 of the report (p. 39-40).

According to Kyte's outline we would extrapolate the following suggestions from the findings of the study.

a) An average of 3.95 topics per session were discussed in the supervisory sessions that were most satisfying to the student teachers, as compared with the least satisfying supervisory sessions which had an average of 5.82 topics discussed per session.

The student teachers' perception of the number of topics that can be positively incorporated in any one feedback session tended to be in line with Kyte's suggestions.

b) The findings of the study suggest that review of performance was the first topic used in establishing rapport. Noteworthy, however, was that the more effective supervisors used review of performance consistently to establish such rapport.

This is in line with one of Kyte's findings since they gave it minor stress or passing mention whereas the less effective supervisors tended to give it as equal stress as classroom management and instructional planning.

This observation would also suggest that whereas the more effective supervisors concentrated their initial efforts on one general area in order to establish rapport essential for holding an effective supervisory feedback session, the less effective supervisors gave divided attention to this and went right into discussions of specific areas of performance -- a behaviour which was less satisfying to the student teachers.

c) Presentation of lesson was the topic most often used in ending supervisory sessions. (In terms of Kyte's findings, it can be concluded that the repetition of presentation of lesson at the end of the supervisory sessions suggested the contribution of this topic to subsequent effective teaching.

3. The most effective supervisors were those who demonstrated considerable supportiveness during the feedback sessions. Specifically, the student teachers tended to value supervisory conferences that were interactive and yet non-directive. The two styles discussed in the literature review of the works of Clothier and Kingsley (p. 53-59) suggest a relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee that is problem rather than personality centred and requires an open and collegial relationship to facilitate interaction

between the participants. Participants share the responsibility for successful conferences.

Other studies cited in the literature review that seemed to support this conclusion included Carkhuff, 1969; Brammer, 1973; Blumberg and Weber, 1968; Blumberg and Amidon, 1965; Salek, 1975; and Oliva, 1976 (see p. 59).

4. A general comparison of overall supervisory effectiveness of faculty consultants and cooperating teachers between and within schools indicated that the student teachers felt more positively about the type of feedback they received from cooperating teachers than from the faculty consultants. Whatever the reason, the cooperating teachers' feedback tended to offer more satisfaction to student teachers than did the faculty consultants' feedback.

The familiarity of the cooperating teachers with the school system and the classroom pupils and the amount of time they spent with the student teachers made it much easier for them to suggest useful areas of professional growth for the student teachers. The easier access to the classrooms of cooperating teachers made it possible for them to provide most of their feedback in privacy which was more satisfactory to the student teachers.

5. The schools that had the most effective supervisors were the schools whose principals offered the most support to the supervisors and student teachers. Other staff members in such schools were also sensitive to the

needs of the three groups of people above and showed the most cooperation. This conclusion was also observed and felt by most faculty consultants and student teachers.

Generally, supervisory feedback was helpful in building up the student teachers' self-confidence; in enhancing the student teachers' understanding of basic philosophical issues about teaching; in encouraging the student teachers to gain and learn from working together with experienced supervisors, especially cooperating teachers; in making the student teachers aware of their progress on an ongoing basis; and, in eliminating the the threats associated with progress assessment by maintaining casual, informal settings for the feedback sessions.

There were some areas in which supervisory feedback was not as helpful as the student teachers would have liked or expected it to be. There was dissatisfaction on the part of the student teachers related to the poor timing of the feedback sessions, the inadequacy of feedback received, the inadequacy of the frequency of visitations and/or observations made by the supervisors, the inadequate matching of student teachers' personality with the personality of the supervisors, the lack of provision of constructive, specific and concrete feedback, and the lack of consensus or precision regarding various procedures for evaluating student teachers.

Inadequate involvement of student teachers in self-evaluation (both formative and summative), insufficient time for lesson planning due to pressures supervisors placed on student teachers for good performance in accordance with university and cooperating school standards, and the threat of "intrusion" into the student teachers' classroom by faculty consultants and some cooperating teachers were also noteworthy areas of concern.

The findings of this study and conclusions drawn from them raise a number of issues which have significance for the long-term preparation of teachers and supervisors of teachers.

Implications for Administration and Training of Supervisors

The following implications are pertinent to administrators and teacher educators who work closely with student teachers and to trustees and policy makers who make decisions about funding and who formulate policies regarding selection and placement of school teachers and principals.

1. The faculty consultants tended to lack enough time for classroom visitations, observations and feedback sessions whereas cooperating teachers tended to offer unsolicited opinion.

Policy, procedures and resources for coping with this apparent problem should be examined. The general desire of the student teachers was that the school visitation by the faculty consultants should be on a regular weekly, if not daily basis. The more frequent visits and classroom observations would reduce the threat that the occasional visits, often scheduled, pose to the student teachers.

Perhaps the possibility of increasing the ratio of faculty consultants to student teachers has some potential towards elimination of the problem. A more favorable supervisor-student teacher ratio would assure the faculty consultants fewer students to observe, increased time for observation and feedback sessions and increased efficiency. The present practice of hiring practicum associates is a step in the desired direction. Perhaps more such people should be appointed on full-time basis to act as liaison between the teacher education institutions and the schools and also to be mediators between student teachers and their supervisors.

The teacher education institutions should also consider further reduction of the faculty consultants' teaching load. Such a step would perhaps reinforce the importance of the role of the faculty consultants by making it into a full-time job. Another suggestion would be to do away with the faculty consultants' role altogether. This step would eliminate some of the problems associated with their role.

2. The supportiveness of the supervisors, principals, and to a lesser extent other staff members, emerged as a strong positive factor in the student teachers' satisfaction with the feedback and consequently, as an important determinant of effectiveness of supervisory feedback processes.

The items on the three research instruments that have been identified in the findings of this study to be sources of satisfaction indicative of supervisory support such as collegiality and expertise in provision of feedback should be carefully assessed by administrators of the student teaching component of teacher education. The items would provide a valuable basis for the workshops held prior to student teaching. Such information should also provide some useful link between theory, as provided by teacher education institutions, and practice, as experienced by student teachers in actual classroom teaching.

Supervisors need this support too. Policies on funding student teaching and personnel involved should consider elevating the roles of the supervisors by honoraria and other support. The importance of providing faculty consultants with adequate time for supervision has already been mentioned. Other support-inducing steps would include reimbursement for travel expenses during school visitations, provision of substitute teachers for cooperating teachers to enable them to attend workshops and in-service sessions, and provision of special conference rooms, other than the staffroom, that can be utilized for consultation.

There is need to consider developing the principals' awareness of their roles in supervision of student teaching and training them for it. A stronger leadership role of the principals in such supervision would enhance the nature of support required by those involved in supervision of student teachers. Supervisors, however, should be prepared so that they can be supportive of student teachers and yet also play their evaluative roles objectively.

3. The findings of the study indicated that the student teachers perceived the feedback from cooperating teachers more positively than they did the feedback from the faculty consultants. The most important factor in this observation was that the student teachers got more assistance on a continuing basis from the cooperating teachers. Situational rather than personal factors may have led to the differences in the student teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of cooperating teachers' and faculty consultants' feedback.

Serious consideration should therefore be given to keeping faculty consultants in touch with actual classroom teaching in the schools. This includes being acquainted with the pupils, current theories, text books, methodology and any other areas relevant to successful teaching. Such a step would give them a 'feel' for what goes on in schools and what the student teachers actually experience in the classrooms.

4. The student teachers did not express a favourable attitude towards categorization of their performances within the range of excellent to very poor, suggesting, perhaps, that the use of a pass/fail category of classification should be used pending feasibility assessments. This might ease, to some extent, the stressful nature of supervision that seems oriented toward categorizing people along some

continuum, the extremities of which are ambiguous. Self-evaluation on the part of student teachers should be an integral part of any format of evaluation adopted during student teaching.

The lack of consensus in the evaluation procedures suggested that both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers, despite workshops organized prior to commencement of student teaching, did not seem to agree or rely on specific guidelines for evaluation.

5. Inadequacy of the provision of feedback was observed on the part of both faculty consultants and cooperating teachers, suggesting that more training of supervisors in discriminatory classroom observations and consequent feedback sessions would be desirable.

The 15 principles of effective supervision generated in the literature review and included in the Feedback Analysis Form have potential for developing more effective supervision skills as well as for providing specific guidelines for dispensing supervisory feedback if positive results are to be expected from student teachers.

The guidelines offered by Blumberg (1974), Kyte (1962), Hyman (1975) and Hunter (1980) are particularly useful tools from which important concepts for training or in-service education of supervisors of student teachers could be derived.

6. The concerns of the student teachers with the feedback sessions and the findings of the research seemed to suggest that there are areas of concern to which attention

should be paid.

The concerns included encouraging collegial rather than superior - subordinate relationships between supervisors and student teachers; dissemination of knowledge (especially the knowledge generated from research such as this) to relevant persons involved in supervision; provision of more time to faculty consultants, in particular for school visitations and/or hiring practicum associates by the university to do the visits; and involvement of third parties other than supervisors in evaluative supervision. Such practices, however, have various associated problems, administrative inconveniences, duplication of roles, and monetary considerations being only a few of them.

7. The frequency of contact between cooperating teachers' and student teachers may explain why personality clashes between the two were more likely than between faculty consultants and student teachers. There seems to be a need for administrators of student teaching to generate ways and means of matching student teacher and cooperating teacher personalities.

Some research in this area may prevent the upheavals that personality clashes can create for those involved in student teaching, especially if such occur after the commencement of the student teaching. Such a basic philosophy should also offer some specific guidelines for placing student teachers in certain schools and for the choice of subjects, if possible. Religious affiliation is one such important area to consider since some schools tend to be conservative with certain subjects unless the student teachers share the same religious convictions. This is not to suggest that the efforts at matching personalities should jeopardize the quality of supervision rendered to student teachers in most cooperating schools.

Implications for Further Research

The implications of the findings of this study for administration and training or in-service education of supervisors of student teachers as cited above have generated areas which future research might productively explore:

1. A replication of this study with a more extended stratified random sample of student teachers and supervisors throughout the province would provide more definitive and more generalizable conclusions.

If the sample, for example, included other student teachers in the various teacher education programs in the province of Alberta, if the student teachers were sampled to include those teaching in elementary, junior and senior high schools and if there were several groups of student teachers working under the same conditions, the generalizability of the outcomes would be increased. It should also be noted that of the 25 student teachers included in the study sample, there was only one male.

2. There is evidence from the findings of the study

that provision of effective feedback by faculty consultants could be improved. Further research might therefore focus on the following issues:

a) The situational or other specific factors which contribute to the more favourable perceptions of cooperating teachers' supervisory feedback over those of the faculty consultants. Such research would be school and university based in an experimental setting. The investigation could be extended to provide information regarding any existing personality characteristics that enable some supervisors to cope with supervision of student teaching more than others and they can be incorporated into the training programs for supervisory roles. Such information can offer useful guidelines for the selection of cooperating teachers and faculty consultants for supervisory roles.

b) The roles of cooperating teachers and faculty consultants in effective supervision of student teachers. Some questions which such a study would attempt to address would be: (i) To what extent are the faculty consultants' roles identical or not identical to those of cooperating teachers? (ii) What are the roles of the two groups of supervisors as perceived by student teachers? by administrators? by the supervisors themselves? (iii) Are both groups of supervisors necessary for effective supervision of student teachers or can one group perform the role just as sufficiently (suggesting doing away with the role of one)? (iv) Which of the two supervisors should evaluate student teachers? One, both or a neutral third party such as faculty representative or ombudsman?

Research dealing with modes of feedback (other than supervisors) is needed. Self-feedback, pupil feedback and feedback via audio and video tapes should be studied more carefully. Perhaps improved skills at the use of other modes of feedback would reduce the loads of supervision and the threat of supervisor-supervisee confrontation.

Research is also needed to determine whether similar results would be obtained if classroom observations were analyzed using different teaching skills. Perhaps the most effective method of dispensing feedback varies from skill to skill. For example, it may be that supervisory feedback is most effective for the development of questioning techniques but videotaped feedback is most effective for improving self-confidence.

3. In this study, most feedback was provided for student teachers after each lesson taught. A study employing various schedules for providing feedback may be useful. For example, if it were found that it was equally effective to provide feedback after every second or third lesson, or at

the end of the day, or every second day, much time and energy would be saved and the student teachers would, perhaps, not be as overwhelmed with feedback as some of them indicated in this study, especially from cooperating teachers.

Research to determine the efficacy of programs for reducing stressful supervision, both preservice and in-service is timely. Student teachers also need exposure to such programs through workshops so that they can cope with such supervision.

4. This study investigated the effectiveness of supervisory feedback when only two supervisors were used for each student teacher. Further study of this variable using a number of different supervisors, in an experimental setting, and controlling for specific role prescriptions, could increase understanding of the ramifications of feedback styles.

It would be of interest, too, to identify the reactions of student teachers to the major styles or typologies of supervisory conferences discussed in the literature review, that is, directive, nondirective, interactive, instructional and evaluative conferences.

Useful information could also be gathered on the relative effectiveness of using one or several supervisors in any given period of student teaching. Case studies relating selected supervisory practices to the satisfaction of student teachers would be useful assets.

5. Finally, an effort must be made to determine the

transferability of skills mastered by student teachers in a number of supervisory feedback settings to actual classroom settings over a period of time. Such research would yield some insight into the overall effectiveness of supervision and perhaps reveal if supervisory sessions are worth the time and resources invested in them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, Gordon W.
1955 Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven.

Amidon, Edmund J., Kathleen M. Kies, and Antony T. Palisi
1966 "A Technique for Improving Teaching Behavior." National Elementary Principal, XLV:54-58.

Antony, W. A.
1971 "A Methodological Investigation of the Minimally Facilitative Level of Interpersonal Function." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 27:156-157.

Association for Student Teaching
1970 A Guide to Professional Excellence in Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching.

Association of Teacher Educators
1973 Guidelines to Clinical Experiences in Teacher in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: A.T.E.

Barnett, D.
1975 "The Emergence of New Concepts of Teacher Education Field Experience." Interchange, 6:44-8.

Belanger, M. L.
1962 "An Exploration of the Use of Feedback in Supervision." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Bennie, William A.
1964 "Campus Supervision of Student Teaching: A Closer Look." Teachers College Journal, 36:133, December.

Blumberg, A.
1974 Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War. Berkeley, California: McCutchan.

Blumberg, A. and Edmund Amidon
1963 "Teacher Reactions to School Faculty Meetings." Journal of Educational Research, LVI:466-470, May - June.

Blumberg, A. and Edmund Amidon
1965 "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor - Teacher Interaction." *Administrators' Notebook*, XIV:1, University of Chicago.

Blumberg, A., E. Amidon and A. A. Weber
1968 "Teacher Morale as a Function of Perceived Supervisor Behavioral Style." *Journal of* Educational Research, 62:109-113.

Bohrnstodt, George W.
1967 "A Methodological Note Comparing the Questionnaire and the Interview." *Journal of Psychological Studies*, 15:1:29-38.

Bond, Patricia Y.
1969 "The Effects of Feedback on Teacher Verbal Behavior and Attitudes Toward In-service Education." Denton, Texas: Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, 1970.

Boschee, F., D. R. Prescott and D. D. Hein
1978 "Do Cooperating Teachers Influence the Educational Philosophy of Student Teachers?" *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29:2:57-61.

Bouchard, Jr., and J. Thomas
1976 "Field Research Methods: Interviewing, Questionnaires, Participant Observation, Systematic Observation, Unobtrusive Measures." In Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bradley, R. S.
1966 "Clarifying the Supervising Teacher's Role." *Teachers College Journal*, 38:92-94, December.

Brammer, L. M.
1973 *The Helping Relationship: Process and Skills*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Brehaur, Willard
1975 *Ontario Elementary School Teachers' Evaluation of Their Teacher Education Programs: Final Report*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, p. 128.

Brown, Alan F.
1961 "The Differential Effect of Stress - Inducing Supervision on Classroom Teaching Behavior." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Alberta.

Brown, A. B., M. R. Cobban and F. T. Waterman
1966 "The Analysis of Verbal Teaching Behavior: An Approach to Supervisory Conferences with Student Teachers." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Cannell, Charles F. and Robert L. Kahn
1968 "Interviewing." In Gardner, Lindzey and Eliot Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Second Edition, p. 526-595, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Carkhuff, R. R.
1969 Helping and Human Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

1972 "Some Reflections on Helping and Human Resource Development Models." The Counselling Psychologist, 3:79-87.

Clothier, Grant and Elizabeth Kingsley
1973 Enriching Student Teaching Relationships: Supervising Teacher Edition. ERIC Document ED 086 653, Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization.

Cogan, Morris
1972 Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton - Mifflin.

Combs, A. W.
1974 The Professional Education of Teachers: A Humanistic Approach to Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Comfort, Ronald E.
1974 "Who's Writing About What in Education's Major Journals?" Education Leadership, 31:663-667, May.

Conant, J.
1963 The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cope, Edith
1974 "Research into the Practical Elements of Teacher Training, with Special Reference to the Supervisory Processes and Student Learning." In How Long is a Piece of String? London: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Copeland, Willis D. and Donald Atkinson
1978 "Student Teachers' Perceptions of Directive and Non-Directive Supervisory Behavior." The Journal of Educational Research, 7:3:123-126, January - February.

Crosby, Muriel
1969 "The New Supervisor: Caring, Coping, Becoming." In Changing Supervision for Changing Times. Washington D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, p. 51.

Davies, D. and K. Amershek
1969 "Student Teaching." In R. Ebel (Ed.), The Encyclopedia of Educational Research. London: Macmillan.

Denham, Alice
1977 "Clinical Supervision: What We Need to Know About its Potential for Improving Instruction." Contemporary Education, 49:1:3, Fall.

Dewey, J.
1965 "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education." In M. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College Press.

Diamonti, Michael C.
1977 "Student Teaching Supervision: A Reappraisal." The Education Forum, XLI:4:478, May.

Ebel, Robert (Ed.)
1969 Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Fourth Edition. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, p. 1381.

Edmund, N. R., and L. Hemink
1958 "Ways in Which Supervisors Help Student Teachers." Educational Research Bulletin, 37:57-60.

Education Practicum Handbook: Interim Edition
1979-80 Field Services, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Ferguson, George A.
1971 Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Third Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frenzel, N. J.
1977 "Perceptions of University Supervisors." Teacher Educator, 12:4:14-17.

Fuller, F. and O. Brown
1975 "On Becoming a Teacher." In Ryan, K. (Ed.), Teacher Education. The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fuller, Frances F. and Brad A. Manning
1973 "Self-Confrontation Reviewed: A Conceptualization for Video Playback in Teacher Education." Reveiw of Educational Research, 43:4:469-528.

Gerwinner, M. N.
1968 "A Study of the Results of the Interaction of Student Teachers and their Supervising Teachers." Doctoral Thesis, Mississippi State University.

Gibb, J.
1969 "Defensive Communication." Journal of Communication, 11:3.

Glasser, William
1965 Reality Therapy. New York: Harper and Row.

1969 Schools with Failure. New York: Harper and Row.

Goldhammer, Robert
1969 Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Goodlad, J.
1965 "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education. 16:263-270.

Gordon, Thomas
1974 Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden.

Guilford, J. P. and Benjamin Frutcher
1973 Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harris, W.
1963 Videotaping for Student Teachers? ERIC Document ED 098 130.

Henry, Marvin A. and Wayne W. Beasley
1972 Supervising Student Teachers the Professional Way: A Guide for Cooperating Teachers. Indiana: Sycamore.

Hermanowicz, H.
1966 "The Pluralistic World of Beginning Teachers." In The Real World of the Beginning Teacher: Report of the Nineteenth National TEPS Conference. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

Hewitson, Malcolm Thomas
1975 "The Professional Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta.

Hill, Joseph E. and August Kerber
1967 Models, Methods, and Analytical Procedures in Education Research. Detroit: Wayne State University.

Hoy, W. K.
1967 "Organization Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology." The Journal of Educational Research, 16:153-155.

Hoy, W. and R. Rees
1977 "The Bureaucratic Socialization of Student Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 28:23-26.

Hunter, Madeline
1980 "Six Types of Supervisory Conferences." Educational Leadership, 37:5:408-412, February.

Hyman, Ronald T.
1977 School Administrator's Handbook of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Methods, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Iannaccone, L.
1963 "Student Teaching: A Transitional Stage in the Making of a Teacher." Theory into Practice, 2:73-80.

Ingalls, John D.
1973 A Trainer's Guide to Andragogy. Revised Edition. Waltham, Mass.: Data Education Incorporated.

Ishler, R. E.
1965 "An Experimental Study Using Withall's Social-Emotional Climate Index to Determine the Effectiveness of Feedback as a Means of Changing Student Teachers' Verbal Behavior." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvaian State University.

Joyce, Bruce R.
1967 Exploration of the Utilization of Personnel in the Supervision of Student Teachers When Feedback via Films and Systems for the Analysis of Teaching are Introduced into the Student Teaching Program, Final Report. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University. ERIC Document ED 020 575.

Kalstounis, Theodore and J. Nelson
1968 "The Mythology of Student Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, 19:3:277-281.

1974 "The Mythology of Student Teaching." In L. Horton and P. Horton (Eds.). Teacher Education: Trends, Issues, Innovations. Danville, Illinois: Interstate, pp. 251-55.

Kerlinger, Fred N.
1973 Foundations of Behavioral Research, Second Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Knowles, M. S.
1970 The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy. New York: Association Press.

Knox, Alan B.
1974 Helping Adults to Learn. University of Illinois. ERIC Document ED 103 670.

Kuhn, Manford H.
1962 "The Interview and the Professional Relationship." In Arnold M. Rose (Ed.). Human Behavior and Social Processes: An Interactionist Approach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kyte, G. C.
1962 "The Effective Supervisory Conference." California Journal of Educational Research. 13:160-168, September.

Leeper, Robert L.
1970 "To Use an Option." Education Leadership, 28:4, October.

MacGraw, F. M.
1965 "The Use of 35mm Time Lapse Photography as a Feedback and Observational Instrument in Teacher Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.

MacKay, D. A.
1979 Project QUEST: Teaching Strategies and Pupil Achievement. Edmonton: Centre for Research in Teaching, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Main, Laurie P.
1972 "The Effect of Feedback Variables on Performance and Attitude in Microteaching." Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, University of Manitoba, Microfilm No. LB 01 463.

Maslow, A. H.
1943 "The Authoritarian Character Structure." Journal of Social Psychology, 18:410-411.

1962 Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Matthews, C. C.
1967 "Classroom Verbal Behavior and Science Student Teachers and Their Cooperating Teachers." Journal of Research in Science Teaching. 5:193-201.

Milanovich, Anthony
1966 "Wanted: More Good Supervising Teachers." Elementary School Journal. 67:22-7, October.

Mitzel, Harold E.
1964 "A New Purpose for Student Teaching." Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference of the Association for Student Teaching. Ithaca, N.Y.: School of Education, Cornell University.

Morrison, V. B., and W. R. Dixon
1964 "New Techniques of Observation and Assessment of Student Teaching." The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge. 43rd Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls: The Association, p. 96-103.

Moser, James Michael
1965 "A Case Study of the Effect of Information Feedback on the Performance of Student Teachers in Mathematics." Unpublished Thesis, University of Colorado.

Mosher, Ralph L. and David E. Purpel
1972 Supervision: The Reluctant Profession. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Mullennex, John M.
1973 A Study of a Training in Helping Relationships Experience for Cooperating Secondary School Teachers and its Effect upon Selected Perceptions of the Teachers and Their Student Teachers. West Virginia University, February. ERIC Document ED 088 792.

National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional
1966 Standards
Who's in Charge Here? Fixing Responsibility for Student Teaching. Discussion paper, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

Oliva, P. F.
1976 Supervision for Today's Schools. New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell.

Ontario Department of Education
1972 Committee on the Costs of Education Interim Report Number One. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, February, p. 33-35.

Peck, R. and Tucker, J.
1972 "Research on Teacher Education." In R. Travers (Ed.), The Second Handbook of Research in Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 940-78.

Ratsoy, Eugene, N. McEwen and Brian Caldwell
1979 Skills of Beginning Teachers. Faculty of Education Program Evaluation Report No. 4. Edmonton, University of Alberta.

Rogers, Carl
1951 Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

1961 On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

1967 "What Psychology Has to Offer to Teacher Education." In Bob Taylor (Ed.), Mental Health and Teacher Education. Forty-sixth Yearbook. Cedar Fall, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching.

Roth, L. H.
1961 "Selecting Supervising Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 12:476-481, December.

Salek, C. J.
1975 "Helping Teachers Versus Evaluating Teachers." NASSP Bulletin, 59:34-38.

Schueler, Herbert and Milton Gold
1964 "Video Recordings of Student Teachers: A Report of the Hunter College Research Project." Journal of Teacher Education, 15:358-364, December.

Seager, G. B.
1965 "The Development of a Diagnostic Instrument of Supervision." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Harvard School of Education.

Sellitiz, Claire, M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch and S. W. Cook
1966 Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sorenson, G. and R. Halpert
1968 "Stress in Student Teaching." California Journal of Educational Research, 19:28-33.

Swineford, E.
1964 "Analysis of Teaching: Improvement Suggestions to Student Teachers." Journal of Experimental Education, 32:299-303, Spring.

Travers, Robert, M. W.
1964 An Introduction to Educational Research, Second Edition. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan.

Tuckman, Bruce W.
1976 "Feedback and the Change Process." Phi Delta Kappan, 341-344, January.

Wiles, Kimball
1955 Supervision for Better Schools: The Role of the Official Leader in Program Development. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Winer, B. J.
1971 Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wright, R. G.
1965 "An Analysis of the Techniques of Guiding Student Teaching Experiences." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California.

Young, J. M. and R. L. Heichberger
1975 "Teachers' Perceptions of an Effective School Supervision and Evaluation Program." Education, 96:10-19.

Yulo, R. G.
1967 An Exploration of the Flaners System of Interaction Analysis as a Supervisory Device with Science Teachers. ERIC Document ED 023 574.

Zeichner, K.
1978 "The Student Teaching Experience." Action in Teacher Education, 1:1:58-61, January.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: THE FEEDBACK ANALYSIS FORM

1. Hyman's Original Feedback Analysis Form (blank)
2. Hyman's Original Feedback Analysis Form (completed)
3. Modified Feedback Analysis Form used for the Study

HYMAN'S ORIGINAL FEEDBACK ANALYSIS FORM (BLANK)

Giver ______________________________ *Date* ____________________

Receiver ______________________________

Observer ______________________________

Below are 13 scales to use in analyzing the feedback you give or receive or observe. Analyze each item by circling the appropriate number on the scale.

								Notes on particular instances
1. Emphasized performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	Emphasized personal qualities	
2. Based on observations	1	2	3	4	5	6	Based on inferences	
3. Descriptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Evaluative	
4. Specific & Concrete	1	2	3	4	5	6	General & Abstract	
5. Well-timed	1	2	3	4	5	6	Poorly timed	
6. Giver shared information	1	2	3	4	5	6	Giver gave advice	
7. Emphasized alternatives	1	2	3	4	5	6	Emphasized "the" path	
8. Framed in "more or less" terms	1	2	3	4	5	6	Framed in "either/or" terms	
9. Based on receiver's needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	Based on giver's needs	
10. Useful and manageable amount given	1	2	3	4	5	6	Overload given	
11. Emphasized modifiable items	1	2	3	4	5	6	Emphasized nonmodifiable items	
12. Emphasized requested aspects	1	2	3	4	5	6	Emphasized imposed items	
13. Checked receiver summarized	1	2	3	4	5	6	Unchecked receiver did not summarize	

HYMAN'S ORIGINAL FEEDBACK ANALYSIS FORM (completed)

ver Leslie Walker

ceiver Donna Messer

server —

Date 12/3/

Below are 13 scales to use in analyzing the feedback you give or receive or observe. Analyze each item by circling the appropriate number on the scale.

				Notes on particular instances
1.	Emphasized performance	1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5 6	Emphasized personal qualities	
2.	Based on observations	1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5 6	Based on inferences	
3.	Descriptive	1 2 [✓ 3] 4 5 6	Evaluative	
4.	Specific & Concrete	1 2 [✓ 3] 4 5 6	General & Abstract	
5.	Well-timed	[✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6	Poorly timed	on next day
6.	Giver shared information	1 2 [✓ 3] 4 5 6	Giver gave advice	
7.	Emphasized alternatives	1 2 3 [✓ 4] 5 6	Emphasized "the" path	only one way given for rearranging the room
8.	Framed in "more or less" terms	1 2 [✓ 3] 4 5 6	Framed in "either/or" terms	
9.	Based on receiver's needs	1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5 6	Based on giver's needs	
10.	Useful and manageable amount given	1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5 6	Overload given	
11.	Emphasized modifiable items	[✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6	Emphasized non-modifiable items	
12.	Emphasized requested aspects	1 2 3 [✓ 4] 5 6	Emphasized imposed items	added in stuff on climate anyhow
13.	Checked—receiver summarized	[✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6	Unchecked—receiver did not summarize	

OFFICE USE ONLY
CC

FEEDBACK ANALYSIS FORM

(Student Teachers)

Your Name ______________________ For Week Ending ______________ 1981 1 - 2
3
Your School ______________________ Faculty Consultant ( ) 4
Cooperating Teacher ( ) 5

Below are fifteen pairs of words, each dealing with characteristics of feedback from your practicum supervisors. Please circle that one number of the six numbers between the pairs that best indicates your perception of the characteristics of the feedback you received over the week. The closer you place your circle toward one characteristics, the better you think that characteristic describes the feedback you received.

You are requested to fill out two of these forms each week, one for your faculty consultant and the other for your cooperating teacher.

In the space provided on the right-hand side of the form, you may write any comments, notes or examples, if any.

				Remarks/Comments/Notes	
1.	Supportive	1 2 3 4 5 6	Non-supportive		6
2.	Emphasized performance	1 2 3 4 5 6	Emphasized personal qualities		7
3.	Based on observations	1 2 3 4 5 6	Based on inferences		8
4.	Descriptive	1 2 3 4 5 6	Evaluative		9
5.	Specific and concrete	1 2 3 4 5 6	General and abstract		10
6.	Well-timed	1 2 3 4 5 6	Poorly timed		11
7.	Giver shared information	1 2 3 4 5 6	Giver gave advice		12
8.	Emphasized alternatives	1 2 3 4 5 6	Emphasized "the" path		13
9.	Framed in "more or less" terms	1 2 3 4 5 6	Framed in "either-or" terms		14
10.	Based on receiver's needs (includes negative criticism)	1 2 3 4 5 6	Based on giver's needs and what he/she wants to get off his/her chest		15
11.	Useful and manageable amount given	1 2 3 4 5 6	Overload given		16
12.	Emphasized modifiable items	1 2 3 4 5 6	Emphasized non-modifiable items		17
13.	Emphasized requested items	1 2 3 4 5 6	Emphasized imposed items		18
14.	Checked; receiver encouraged to summarize	1 2 3 4 5 6	Unchecked; receiver not encouraged to summarize		19
15.	Privacy ensured - interruptions and distractions minimized	1 2 3 4 5 6	No privacy - interruptions and distractions evident		20

APPENDIX B: THE POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE CHECKLIST

	Time in Minutes																				Carried Forward			Total		
Topic Areas	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.5	6.0	6.5	7.0	7.5	8.0	8.5	9.0	9.5	10.0	✓	X	O	✓	X	O
1. PERSONAL QUALITIES																										
2. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING																										
3. CONTENT OF LESSON																										
4. PRESENTATION OF LESSON																										
5. QUALITY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP																										
6. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT																										
7. DISCIPLINE																										
8. REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE																										
9. INFORMAL CONVERSATION																										
10. OTHERS e.g.																										

Name of School -------------- Name of Student----------------- Week---------------

O=CT X=FC ✓ =ST

APPENDIX C: THE SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Main's Attitude Survey
2. Joyce's "On Call" Reports by College Supervisors - Form A
3. Joyce's Monthly Questionnaire for Supervisory Adequacy - Form C_2
4. The Satisfaction Questionnaire (used for the study)

MAIN'S ATTITUDE SURVEY

The following items are not designed to test your knowledge. Instead, they are meant to explore some of your feelings and points of view toward the method of feedback you experienced. There are no right or wrong answers. Further, your responses will be confidential and they will in no way be used for grading purposes in this course. Respond in terms of how you feel, not how you think others feel or how you think you should feel.

Read each item carefully and then circle the symbol that best expresses your point of view.

Work rapidly. Please respond to every item.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
U - Uncertain
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

SA A U D SD 1. If I could go back in time and start the Micro-teaching course over again I would like to receive feedback in the same way.

SA A U D SD 2. I feel satisfied that I can now ask more penetrating questions in a probing session.

SA A U D SD 3. I value the new ideas I picked up by watching others teach.

SA A U D SD 4. I approve of the number of people that were involved in my feedback sessions.

SA A U D SD 5. My self confidence as a teacher has been lowered as a result of the feedback sessions.

SA A U D SD 6. The feedback sessions motivated me to improve my skill in questioning.

SA A U D SD 7. I value the knowledge I gained on the techniques of probing.

SA A U D SD 8. I appreciated the supportive spirit evident in the feedback sessions.

SA A U D SD 9. I feel more at ease when probing than I did before the first feedback session.

SA A U D SD 10. I don't think I will increase my use of probing questions when I teach, as a result of the feedback sessions.

SA A U D SD 11. The written material provided was a valuable source of information.

SA A U D SD 12. I felt threatened by the feedback sessions.

SA A U D SD 13. I am more certain about my teaching ability as a result of this course.

SA A U D SD 14. I value the information I received about myself in the feedback sessions.

SA A U D SD 15. I can see evidence of improved skill at probing in myself.

SA A U D SD 16. The comments made during the feedback sessions were redundant and therefore the sessions were boring.

SA A U D SD 17. As a result of the feedback sessions I will have more self confidence when I use probing technique in the classroom.

SA A U D SD 18. The provision of a model, however imperfect, on probing technique at the outset was helpful to me.

SA A U D SD 19. The feedback sessions have not helped me to ask a great variety of probing questions.

SA A U D SD 20. Working with others was an important part of this course.

SA A U D SD 21. I am a better teacher as a result of the sessions on probing.

Form A

JOYCE'S "ON-CALL" REPORTS BY COLLEGE SUPERVISORS

Name of Supervisor ____________________________________

Name of Student ____________________________ Date __________

Approximate length of time of session ________________________

A. Checklist of topics covered during the session. (Note where emphasis was heavy and where light.)

1.	Classroom procedures	0	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Teaching techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.	New activities proposed and/or planned	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Existing activities developed or modified	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Specific children--progress and/or problems	0	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Community affairs as they affect the school	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The student's effectiveness in the classroom	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Ways of making her graduate work more meaningful in the classroom situation	0	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Personal or emotional problems.	0	1	2	3	4	5

B. Was the initiative during the session taken by the supervisor, the student, or both of you?

Form C-2
Student's Form

JOYCE'S MONTHLY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUPERVISORY ADEQUACY

Name of Supervisor ______________________________ Date __________

Name of Student ____

A. How many times have you been visited this past month? __________

B. In what ways has your student teaching experience made you a stronger person or teacher? Explain where necessary.

1. General growth and maturity	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. Better rapport with the children	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. Better rapport with your cooperating teacher	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. More varied approaches to teaching	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Greater ease and confidence in the classroom	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Greater sense of purpose	0	1	2	3	4	5

C. In what areas have you had the most difficulty?

7. Rapport with your cooperating teacher?	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. Rapport with children or discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Classroom procedures and organization	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. Teaching techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. Your own personal or emotional problems	0	1	2	3	4	5

D. Do you feel you have had adequate supervision this month?
Too much? Too Little? Explain if necessary.

E. Have the seminars helped your student teaching experience? Explain.

F. Has taping and filming helped or hindered your teaching experience? Explain.

THE SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following items are not designed to test your knowledge, they are meant to explore some of your feelings and points of view toward the characteristics of feedback you received during the supervisory feedback sessions in the student teaching period you have just completed. There are no right or wrong answers. Further your responses will be confidential and they will in no way be used for grading purposes. Respond in terms of how you feel, not how you think others feel or how you think you should feel. Please answer ALL items, working rapidly and consecutively from the first page through to the last. Read each item carefully and then circle the symbol that best expresses your point of view.

The interpretation of the symbols is:

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
U - Uncertain
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

Note:

You are asked to give two responses for each item; one for the faculty consultant (left column) and one for the cooperating teacher (right column).

Office Use Only (cc)

Your Name______________________________ 1, 2

Your School____________________________ 3

PART A

	Faculty Consultant	Cooperating Teacher	Office Use Only (cc)
1. If I could go back in time and have another round of student teaching, I would like to receive supervisory feedback in the same way.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	4, 5
2. I feel satisfied that I can now perform better as a teacher due to the feedback I received during supervisory feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	6, 7
3. My self-confidence as a teacher has been lowered as a result of the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	8, 9
4. My feedback sessions motivated me to improve my teaching skills.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	10, 11
5. I appreciated the supportive spirit evident in the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	12, 13
6. I don't think I will improve my teaching skills as a result of the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	14, 15
7. I felt threatened by the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	16, 17
8. I value the information I received about myself in the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	18, 19
9. The comments made during the feedback sessions were redundant.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	20, 21
10. The feedback sessions were boring.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	22, 23
11. I felt that my supervisor treated me as a colleague.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	24, 25

	Faculty Consultant	Cooperating Teacher	Office Use Only (cc)
12. I was provided with constructive and specific feedback by my supervisor.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	26, 27
13. My supervisor conferred with me briefly after each lesson to discuss my teaching experience of that particular lesson.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	28, 29
14. I was satisfied with the way my supervisor observed and collected data for the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	30, 31
15. My supervisor prepared carefully for the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	32, 33
16. I liked only positive remarks regarding my classroom teaching during feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	34, 35
17. I felt that some negative feedback during the conferences was helpful to me, in creating in me a desire to improve my performance.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	36, 37
18. I felt that frequently there were discrepancies between what my supervisor observed and my perception of my performance.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	38, 39
19. I felt I was given enough time for feedback by my supervisor.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	40, 41
20. I had the opportunity to discuss what I felt to be weaknessesin my teaching performances.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	42, 43
21. I had the opportunity to discuss what I felt to be strengths in my teaching performances.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	44, 45
22. I felt that the supervisor was genuinely concerned with helping me during the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	46,47
23. I felt that there was inconsistency between the areas stressed during my methods course and those stressed during the feedback sessions.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	48, 49

	Faculty Consultant	Cooperating Teacher	Office Use Only (cc)
24. I regarded the supervisory skills of my supervisor as effective.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	50, 51
25. Due to the feedback sessions, I developed and improved my performance on an ongoing basis.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	52, 53
26. I appreciated the planned follow-up guidance by my supervisor after the student teaching.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	54, 55
27. My supervisor gave concrete examples from the observations of my teaching performances to illustrate areas of strength and weakness in my teaching.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	56, 57
28. I had adequate feedback from my supervisor this last student teaching period.	SA A U D SD	SA A U D SD	58, 59

PART B

29. To what extent have the supervisory feedback sessions been helpful to you in the following areas? Please place a tick (✓) in the appropriate response category.

	Faculty Consultant					Cooperating Teacher					
	a great deal	consid-erable	some	very little	not at all	a great deal	consid-erable	some	very little	not at all	
a) General growth and maturity											60, 61
b) Better rapport with the children											62, 63
c) Better rapport with your cooperating teacher											64, 65
d) More varied approaches to teaching											66, 67
e) Greater ease and confidence in the classroom											68, 69

(Cont.)

	Faculty Consultant					Cooperating Teacher					Office Use Only (cc)
	a great deal	considerable	some	very little	not at all	a great deal	considerable	some	very little	not at all	
f) Discipline in the classroom											70, 71
g) Specific children's academic progress or problems											72, 73
h) Integration of theory and practice											74, 75
i) Personal or emotional problems											76, 77
j) Better rapport with your faculty consultant											78, 79

30. Indicate any other ways not listed above in which the feedback sessions have been helpful to you.

31. Indicate other ways in which you feel the feedback sessions might have been helpful to you but were not. Explain where necessary.

Office Use Only (cc)

32. To what extent were each of the following settings used for the supervisory feedback sessions? Please tick (✓) appropriately. 1 - 3

	Faculty Consultant					Cooperating Teacher					
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
a) Staffroom											4, 5
b) Classroom											6, 7
c) Hallway											8, 9
d) Private Office											10, 11
e) School library											12, 13
f) Other (s) ____________											14, 15
____________											16, 17

33. Indicate by placing a tick (✓) in the appropriate space your satisfaction with the atmosphere of the place(s) your feedback sessions occured. Explain where necessary.

	Faculty Consultant					Cooperating Teacher					
	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Somewhat Satisfactory	Un-Satisfactory	Very Un-Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Somewhat Satisfactory	Un - Satisfactory	Very Un-Satisfactory	
a) Staffroom											18, 19
b) Classroom											20, 21
c) Hallway											22, 23
d) Private Office											24, 25
e) School library											26, 27
f) Others ____________											28, 29
____________											30, 31

34. Name any other places you would have preferred to hold satisfactory feedback sessions. Explain where necessary.

(a) ____________________

(b) ____________________

(c) ____________________

(d) ____________________

(e) ____________________

35. Do you have any additional comments?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.

Pam. E. Wanga

APPENDIX D: PLAN B PRACTICUM PROGRAM

1. An Article on the Plan B Program
2. The Schedule for the 1980-8. Plan B Practicum

"PLAN B": THE UNIVERSITY'S UNKNOWN PROGRAM

An Account of an Alternative Program of Teacher-Education.

Plan B, an alternative Bachelor of Education route, is interestingly paradoxical. While some students carefully avoid it, apparently having heard some well-informed rumors of the unusually hard work, its recent graduates voluntarily worked for a month beyond the end of their year, to prepare a supportive conference presentation on this program.

While few Education faculty show any interest, those involved in its instructional and organizational team usually wish to continue, knowing full well that often less than half of the hours they devote to Plan B will be recognized in terms of teaching load and salary assessment.

Plan B graduates each year report that at job interviews participation in the program is immediately counted in their favor. And yet, in recent B.Ed. program upheavals, an attempt to eliminate Plan B was seriously considered.

The following account shows why it is fortunate that the alternative route continues, and why knowing the program from the inside makes such a difference, for both students and instructors.

For almost a decade, Plan B has been an alternative route in teacher-education, emphasizing education at the elementary school level, which up to thirty-five students can choose in the latter half of their B.Ed. studies (proceeding for the rest of the time according to Plan A guidelines). It is of two terms duration, and in each term about half of the time is spent practice-teaching in elementary schools and half in The University in a study of educational philosophy, psychology, and administration, and curriculum and instructional methods. The program is designed and instructed by a faculty team of four, drawn from the departments of Educational

Foundations, Educational Psychology, Educational Administration and Elementary Education. By contrast, Plan A, the normal route, involves several hundred students.

When identifying the unique strength of Plan B, students repeatedly point to its success in unifying theory and practice, so that theory no longer appears irrelevant and practice is no longer blind. Apart from an initial half-day introductory workshop in late August, Plan B students start their year with two weeks in the school at which the rest of their practice teaching will take place. They thus begin theoretical studies with a vivid first-hand sense of information and skills required and problems to be solved. The remainder of the practicum experience is spread over the year in two to five week blocks, the use of each block being carefully explored in university class work. On return to university after a practicum block there is an immediate seminar in which the ideas and problems of the recent practical experience are shared and critically examined. In addition, the members of the instructional team also act as the students' faculty consultants and play a significant part in practicum supervision and evaluation. This may well be the most important single factor in the unification of theory and practice.

The instructors also have a policy of shaping their practice so as to be consistent with their conception of the best in educational ideas, and so as to provide an example of teaching which is innovative in the light of deepening thought. Student critique of instructional practice is explicitly encouraged for this purpose.

As their name implies, the Integrative Workshops are also worthy of mention here. In the second term, the students prepare, unaided, four-hour workshops around a specific topic for their peers and the faculty team.

Their task is to integrate all they know about education with practices which are appropriate and which they can direct successfully. Afterwards, in an hour-long discussion with the instructors, each group must argue the educational validity and effectiveness of the activities chosen for its workshop. Students report that the Integrative Workshop is a challenge especially useful for developing their confidence in cooperative educational planning. There is some indication that Plan B graduates tend to have more self-confidence as new teachers than those prepared differently. In a song written by recent Plan B graduates, they applaud the program as being the first encouragement in their teacher-preparation to learn to be a teacher, rather than a student. In their own words:

> "After three long years of hard study,
> They'd made a student out of me.
> But no one seemed to care,
> How as a teacher I would fare."

The instructional team favors an unusually wholistic conception of learning, whether more intellectual or more practical learning is concerned. Certainly the Integrative Workshops manifest this, with their exploration and expression of ideas in drama, discussions, lectures, displays, dialogues, films, slide presentations, music, mime and dance. Over four years of Plan B involvement, it has been an education to me to see the high quality of achievement which such a diversified approach to learning encourages. These workshops have permanently altered my conception of the capacity of university undergraduates.

In the evaluation of Plan B, its students continually refer to the way in which alienation of student from student, and student from faculty, is decreased with considerable gain in enjoyment and efficiency of learning. Large faculties like that of Education have to be very sensitive to the importance of the problem, and work very subtly in program structure to avoid this alienation. The instructional team considers such sensitivity to be a 'humanism' as relevant to those engaged in scholastic endeavor as to human beings in other contexts, and highly significant for the release of constructive energies.

As a first step, the academic side of the program begins with a two-day workshop at one of Alberta's lakeside camps. Here a number of activities have the unified purpose of establishing relationships of trust, understanding and warmth, as a basis for all aspects of the year's work. We pursue social and domestic activities together on an equal basis, share larger dimensions of ourselves and lives than the academic setting permits, and look carefully at every aspect of the year's program, explaining and modifying as appropriate. The degree to which this affects the pleasure of subsequent teaching and learning needs to be experienced to be fully appreciated.

The social unity and supportiveness is carried over into the rest of the year in several ways. In class work, group endeavour is encouraged and its fruits shared for mutual enrichment more than competitive evaluation. Having up to seven students with a consultant/instructor in one school for the entire practicum allows a useful spirit of camaraderie and interchange of ideas to develop, effectively countering the anxiety and isolation usually felt on school practice.

The high level of student participation in program design, and the degree to which the students take initiative in planning specific events within it, such as the yearly workshop with cooperative teachers and principals, counter~~s~~ alienation through the ~~in it~~s encouragement of the sense of 'belonging', the sense of the community being 'one's own'. Also, there are the regular student/faculty social events, considered as an integral part of the year.

The systematic encouragement of cooperation and of self-initiated intellectual and planning activity also reflects the instructional team's desire to prepare teachers who are 'professional' in the significant sense of being able to exercise responsibly an informed independence of mind, vitalizing what has sunk to the level of daily routine, and transforming the larger imperfections of schooling with novel conceptions and personal commitment. To this end, all instruction is 'open', in that it does not seek to give the right answers, but to provide the best setting in which the students can find them for themselves. This approach has its logical culmination in the philosophy work, which concentrates on the student's articulation, rational defense, and application of a unified philosophy of education of his or her own. Instruction, therefore, emphasizes educational vision allied with knowledge, commitment and self-confidence, rather than mechanical technique and blind repetition of habitual practices.

The advantages of the Plan B mode of team work for faculty members are not hard to identify. There is the sheer satisfaction of really working as a team; few who experience this as it operates in Plan B seem to prefer the more 'isolationist' interpretation of university professorship. But in addition, there is the satisfaction in a small team of having a considerably greater control over the kind of larger program of which one's teaching is a part, and thus more opportunity to exercise a creativity as a scholar and educator which goes beyond the confines of a departmentally prescribed course and a research project. The regular team meetings, and the joint planning of the entire academic year, give a freshness of perspective and interdisciplinary breadth hard to attain otherwise. Of course, any Education professor who participates in faculty consulting in the schools can use this experience as a much-needed grounding for theory development. However, in

Plan B there is the added satisfaction of frequently being able to explore, with one's theory students in a jointly experienced practical setting, the relevance of the ideas examined in university courses. The amplified relationship with students is a welcome relief from the shallow communication so often present in the usual structuring of university teaching. My involvement in Plan A and previous membership in another faculty gives me an acute sense of the contrast.

A side of Plan B instruction which I hope can be considerably expanded is the spontaneous faculty team dialogue in class. In response to problems posed by students or to a commonly experienced situation, the team makes an unrehearsed attempt through dialogue to give a demonstration of the way in which the perspectives of different specializations are jointly applicable, and of the way in which theoretical differences may be rationally approached and turned to advantage.

While the interest of a Plan B approach to the Department of Secondary Education is obvious, the relevance of aspects of it to other sectors of The University should not be ignored. For example, in addition to the general applicability of its "praxis" and "humanism", there is the advantage of an alternative program in any faculty. I regard the contrast between Plans A and B as an extremely healthy aspect of the Faculty of Education, in terms of the generation of critical thought essential to progress. Outside of The University, Plan B constitutes a challenge to other Education faculties--a challenge delivered explicitly in May by a group of Plan B faculty and students at the Banff Second Tri-University Conference on Teacher Education.

Dr. Foster N. Walker
Department of Educational
Foundations

PLAN B - 1980-81

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

August 27 or 28	On Campus 9:00 - 4:00
August 28 or 29	School Staff Meetings
September 2	In School
September 8	In School
September 12	Retreat
September 15	On Campus
September 22	
September 29	
October 6	
October 13*	
October 20	In School
October 27	
November 3	
November 10**	On Campus
November 17	
November 24	
December 1	
December 8	
December 12	End of Term
January 5	On Campus
January 12	
January 19	Integrative Workshops
January 26	
February 2	
February 9	Planning Week
February 16	Reading Week
February 23	In School
March 2	
March 9	
March 16	
March 23	
March 30	On Campus
April 6	Special Practicum
April 13***	Special Practicum

*October 13 - Thanksgiving
**November 11 - Remembrance Day
***April 17 - Good Friday

APPENDIX E: INITIAL REQUEST FORMS AND LETTERS OF APPROVAL

1. Cooperative Activities Program (Initial Request Form)
2. Letter of Approval from Edmonton Catholic School District
3. Letter of Approval from Edmonton Public School Board
4. Request for Research Summary

COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES PROGRAM
(Initial Request Form)

O.K

1. Nature of Activity (Check one)

Student Teaching Internship ________

Demonstration/Experimentation ________

Special Practicum ________

Research Yes

2. Organization to be Involved

Edmonton Public School System Yes

Edmonton Separate School System Yes

County of Strathcona ________

St. Albert Protestant/Separate School System ________

N.A.I.T. ________

3. Requestor (University staff member)

Name Dr. Gordon McIntosh Department Ed. Admin.

Telephone 432-3681 Position Professor Date 8-9-80

Request made on behalf of Mrs. Pam E. Wanga - Doctoral Student
(Name)

609D Michener Park, Edmonton, Alta, T6H-5A1 436-0236
(Address) (Telephone)

4. Description of Activity - Include title, objectives, procedure, evaluation, techniques, etc.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET PLEASE

5. Anticipated value to requestor:

Will provide data for Doctoral Thesis

6. Anticipated value to cooperating organization:

Both educative and as a source of information.

7. Estimate of cost (see remuneration guidelines):

Any costs incurred will be met by researcher

8. Suggested personnel, schools and times:

Principals, Cooperating Teachers, Faculty Consultants Student teachers. Elementary schools so far identified are: Afton, Malmo, Kensington, St. Boniface, and Meadowlark.

See attached sheet for details on times

For Office Use Only:

Approved by ______________, Field Services Date Sept 17/80

Approved by T. Blowers Date Sept 22/80

Subject to the following conditions:

(a) A report of the results of findings of this project is required by the cooperating school system (check one) yes ☒ no ☐

(b) Other

Edmonton Catholic School District

EDUCATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CENTRE
TELEPHONE (403) 429-7631 — 9807 - 106 STREET, EDMONTON, ALBERTA T5K 1C2

303

1980 09 24

Mr. W.A. Kiffiak
Room 341, Education South
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

Dear Mr. Kiffiak:

Please be advised that the following Cooperative Activities Program projects have been approved.

i) The Development of Procedures for Estimation of Body Composition and Norms for Children Aged 7 - 14 years: Requested by Dr. H.A. Quinney.

ii) Student observation of children in physical education activities. Requested by Ms. Jan Vallance.

iii) Feedback to Student Teachers. Requested by Dr. Gordon McIntosh on behalf of Mrs. Pam Wanga.

Yours truly,

C. Hommersen
Test Coordinator

CH/cm

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

September 23, 1980

Mr. W. A. Kiffiak
School Liaison Officer
Division of Field Experiences
Faculty of Education
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G3

Dear Mr. Kiffiak:

Re: University of Alberta Research Request - "Feedback and Perceived Satisfaction of Student Teachers" - Pam E. Wanga

The above research request has been approved on a permissive basis following examination by our department.

The schools have not been contacted concerning the request because I am unaware of the names of the schools where the student teachers will be placed. The requestor should directly contact the schools concerned to obtain approval and to make the arrangements necessary for conducting the study.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the results of the study as soon as they are available.

Sincerely,

T. A. Blowers, Ph. D.
Director Research

TAB/sm
Attach.

cc: G. McIntosh
P. Wanga

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH & EVALUATION

To the Researcher:

In line with the cooperative Activities Program condition that a summary of the results of a research project is required by the cooperating school system, would you please cooperate by completing the attached "Research Summary" form. Completion of the summary will help to ensure that the results of your research are accurately interpreted for our school system personnel.

The summary will be used for two purposes:

1) To provide feedback to specific schools which were directly involved in your research project; and

2) To reproduce and compile the research summaries into a Research Bulletin which will be sent to all schools.

We are looking foward to receiving the "Research Summary" upon completion of your project. If possible, we would also appreciate receiving a copy of your full research report or thesis. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Tom

Tom Blowers, Ph.D.
DIRECTOR - RESEARCH
EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TAB/ja

APPENDIX F: OUTLINE OF INITIAL CONTACTS AND THE RESEARCH DIARY

SPRING-SUMMER, 1980

Proposal development; literature review.

FALL, 1980

September

1. Request for approval to conduct research filed to the Edmonton Public and Catholic School boards on Monday the 8th.
2. Official approval for above request granted by the two school boards on Tuesday, the 23rd.
3. Initial contact with faculty consultants. Researcher outlined her research proposal and requested the faculty consultant's cooperation which was granted.
4. Friday, 26th at 10:00 a.m., first visit to Afton Elementary School. The principal's approval for the research to be carried on in her school granted and her cooperation assured.
5. Tuesday, 30th at 10:00 a.m., initial visit to St. Boniface Elementary School. The principal's approval and support for the research granted.

October

1. Thursday, 2nd at 9 a.m. the researcher had a successful candidacy orals.
2. Initial familiarization contact with Plan B student

teachers on Friday, 10th at 9:30 a.m. in Room 7-1 14 Education North Building. Used part of the instructor's (also researcher's supervisor) class time to introduce myself and familiarize the student teachers with the study and its significance. I then requested their cooperation as the main sample for the study. All the 25 student teachers agreed to participate. It should be noted that the researcher had been introduced to a smaller group of representatives of the student teachers in an earlier meeting organized by the researcher's supervisor (who was also the instructor of and coordinator of the supervisory team for the Plan B practicum program). The representatives had then briefed the rest of the student teachers of the researchers desire to meet with the entire group and spell out her intentions. This initial contact was therefore not "strange" to the group.

3. On Tuesday, the 14th at 4:00 p.m., the researcher, upon the recommendation and prior approval of the faculty consultants and student teachers, attended the Plan B workshop. The workshop was held in Room 2-141 Education North Building. All cooperating teachers and the five principals of the cooperating schools were invited if they could make it to the workshop. The objective of the workshop was to familiarize everyone involved in the student teaching supervision, evaluation and administration of the objectives, expectations and concerns of the Plan B practicum program. The researcher was introduced once again to the entire group

and asked to spell out her intentions. The researcher reminded those principals with whom she had not had initial contact that she would be doing so in the following week. It was an excellent familiarization session for the researcher.

4. On Wednesday, 15th at 12 noon, the researcher sat in a mini workshop presentation with the student teachers and the faculty consultants in Room 177 Education South Building. Another opportunity for familiarization.

5. Initial visit to Kensington Elementary School was on Thursday, the 16th at 11:00 a.m. Clarified intentions to principal and later requested the cooperating teachers' cooperation. Approval to conduct study in the school granted by the principal. The few cooperating teachers who availed themselves for the initial meeting agreed to participate in the study.

6. Monday, 20th. First round of student teaching began. Exploratory data gathering.

7. Monday, the 27th at 8:30 a.m., second visit to St. Boniface Elementary School. Explained intentions to principal and vice-principal, following previous telephone conversation. Sat in a post-observation conference session with one of the student teachers in the school later in the afternoon.

8. Tuesday, the 28th at 9:30 a.m. - initial visit to Meadowlark Elementary School. Interacted with principal, cooperating teachers and student teachers. Sat in and taped

one feedback session. Made notes based on the follow-up interview.

9. Wednesday, the 29th at 9:00 a.m., second visit to Afton Elementary School. Taped three feedback sessions, two for cooperating teachers and one for faculty consultant. Held follow-up interviews.

10. Thursday, the 30th at 10:00 a.m. second visit to St. Boniface Elementary School. Taping and interviewing procedure done for two cooperating teachers' sessions.

11. Friday, the 31st at 10:00 a.m., second visit to Meadowlark Elementary School. One cooperating teacher's feedback session taped and follow-up interview held.

November: More exploratory data gathering

1. Monday, the 3rd at 10:20 a.m. Third visit to Meadowlark School. Two cooperating teachers' sessions taped and follow-up interviews held.

2. Tuesday, the 4th at 8:30 a.m. Initial visit to Malmo Elementary School. Not much done.

3. Wednesday, the 5th at 9:00 a.m. Second visit to Kensington Elementary School. Seven cooperating teachers' sessions taped and follow-up interviews held.

4. Thursday, the 6th at 12 noon. Second visit to Malmo Elementary School. Taped one cooperating teachers' session and held a follow-up interview.

5. Friday, the 7th at 10:00 a.m. Third visit to St. Boniface Elementary School. Above procedure carried on for one cooperating teachers' session. LAST DAY OF THE FIRST

ROUND OF STUDENT TEACHING.

6. Monday, 10th at 12 noon. Lunch with one of the student teachers. Discussion centered around the student teacher's concern over the evaluation of her teaching performance, during the first round of student teaching, by the cooperating teacher. Later met with entire Plan B group to thank them for their cooperation during the 1st round.

WINTER 1980-81

Data collection, observations, questionnaire surveys.

February, 1981

1. 2nd week. Training session to acquaint student teachers with the Feedback Analysis Form (see details in Section III of Chapter Three).
2. February 23-27. First week of student teaching. No data was gathered this week because there was a Teacher's Convention. Besides, the student teachers had not settled to real classroom teaching yet.

March, 1981

1. March 2 - March 27. Data collection as outlined in Chapter Three, Section IV. The schedule for visiting the schools is included in Appendix G.
2. Friday, March 27, END OF SECOND ROUND OF STUDENT TEACHING.

6:30 p.m. Attended Plan B Graduation dinner and dance at the Faculty Club. The student teachers bought two tickets for researcher and spouse. I expressed appreciation for their cooperation.

SPRING, 1981 ONWARDS

Dissertation writing and activities and meetings with student teachers and faculty consultants. It is hoped that the cooperating schools will be revisited towards the end of thesis writing to give feedback to the cooperating teachers and principals highlighting the main findings of the study. Final orals are expected to be scheduled in Fall, 1982.

APPENDIX G: PACKAGE FOR THE TRAINING SESSION*

1. An Analysis of the 15 Items on the Feedback Analysis Form
2. Time Schedule for the Researcher's Visits to the Schools

---

* The actual Feedback Analysis Form and Observation Conference Checklist were included in the training package as explained in Section III of Chapter 3 but are excluded from Appendix G because they appear as Appendices A and B respectively.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 15 PROPOSITIONS OF EFFECTIVE SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK

Below is a summary of the questions derived from the literature review related to the process of supervisory feedback. A few examples are cited at the end of each question.

1. To what extent is the supervisor supportive of the student teacher during the feedback sessions?

Examples: friendly, warm manner rather than distant and aloof.

Other Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

2. To what extent does the feedback being offered emphasize actual patterns of performance rather than personal qualities?

The supervisor is concerned with actual teaching behaviour with an aim of improving teaching performance as opposed to being concerned with the deep-lying patterns of the student teacher's personality.

Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

3. To what extent is the feedback focussed on observations rather than assumptions, inferences, or interpretations?

The supervisor uses and encourages the student teacher to use specific examples and illustrations of what has happened in the classroom and always works from these specific observations in the discussion of the lesson.

Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

4. To what extent is the feedback focussed on description rather than evaluation of the student teacher's performance?

Description has to do with reporting what is going on and is formative in nature aimed at improving the student teacher's performance. Evaluation is summative or judgemental in nature and has to do with how well or not well things have gone.

Example of Description: (Supervisor): "I remember you asking Tom what his age is in the middle of the math lesson. Perhaps we could discuss that."

Other Examples: ______________________

____

____

____

Example of Evaluation: (Supervisor): "It's very poor teaching to ask data gathering questions to pupils without giving your reasons for doing that. Asking Tom how old he was in the middle of your math lesson was a total failure on your part." (Student teacher burst into tears).

Other Examples: ______________________

____

____

____

5. To what extent does the feedback focus on specific, concrete behaviours, rather than the general and abstract?

Specific and concrete feedback places the behaviour of a student teacher in a time and place context as opposed to generalizations conveying the message of a trend over time which may appear to be irreversible.

Example: (Supervisor): "I noticed that when the bell rang for break, the boys started running up and down the classroom . . . " as opposed to, "Always avoid panic when you lose control of the class."

Other Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

6. To what extent is the feedback session well-timed, all things being considered, rather than poorly timed?

The crucial phase in the analysis of instruction is the conference following the teaching. If the conference occurs immediately after the teaching, the perceptions and feelings of both supervisor and teacher are still fresh and acute. There can be disadvantages to an immediate conference, however. Feelings may be too acute (the teacher may be discouraged or defensive or "unobjective"). Further, the supervisor is at a distinct disadvantage if he/she does not have enough time to review the data derived from observation and to begin the process of making tentative inferences and deciding what the data appear to say about the content, the method of teaching and what the children are learning. He/she needs time, too, to decide upon a plan or agenda for the supervision session. Sufficient time, then, for the supervisor and teacher to think, and for the teacher to catch his/her breath emotionally, is very important to the outcome of the conference itself.

Examples: - time of the day

- time demanded of you for the session

Other Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

7. To what extent does the feedback focus on sharing information rather than on giving advice?

Included here are statements that clarify, build on, or develop ideas or suggestions by the (student) teacher. This behaviour would be demonstrated if the (supervisor) responds to the student teacher's ideas by participating in the development of the ideas or by agreeing with the idea as it is presented. For example, a student might want to implement a teaching strategy which had been taught at the college or which he/she had developed. The (supervisor) would either agree that the idea be implemented or would ask the student to elaborate on the idea and would assist him/her in operationalizing it, assuming it was feasible.

Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

8. To what extent does the feedback provide alternative approaches that will allow the student teacher to improve rather than offer the best path to improvement?

Example: Supervisor brings forward alternatives for consideration by the student teacher by suggesting that "increasing small groups and/or providing more activities, and/or using mini-units so as to appeal to more students," rather than, "the best way to get students to participate is to put them into small groups with their own leaders."

Other Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

9. To what extent does the feedback focus on information and ideas phrased in terms of "more or less" (or some such terms) rather than "either-or"?

More or less terminology shows that there is a continuum along which the teacher's actions fall (allowing room for improvement). Either-or terminology connotes an absolute situation of two extremes without any middle ground. . . . The many complex variables in teaching require us (supervisors) to keep a sliding continuum in mind without a pre-determined extreme position. For example, speak about "asking less questions per lesson" rather than "either the teacher or the students should question but not both."

Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

10. To what extent does the feedback, including negative criticism focus on what the student teacher needs for improvement of performance rather than on what the supervisor needs to get off (supervisor's) chest?

This category includes all negative value judgements about the (student) teacher, one's behaviour in the classroom, any behaviour on the part of the supervisor that can be interpreted as defensive, aggressive, or tension producing. Examples of non-supportive behaviour (which may not be required by the student teacher at the conference situation) on the part of the (supervisor) would be comments about the student's physical appearance or his/her stated values and goals.

Example: (Supervisor): "With all the competition for teaching positions, you (the student teacher) will have a hard time getting a job."

Hyman (1975:148) suggested the following:

> Even though the supervisor may have several things on his (her) mind which will impart a sense of release to you, your first consideration must be the meaningfulness of the feedback to the teacher. If the supervisor must get a few things off his (her) chest perhaps a separate conference or casual meeting would be better so as to differentiate the feedback session from the release session.

Other Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

11. To what extent does the feedback focus on selected items that the student teacher can use and manage rather than on all the information the supervisor has gathered?

In each conference, it is probably far more effective to deal with a limited number of items - perhaps two or three. This gives the student teacher a clear focus for future lessons. A "grocery list" of items is usually overwhelming and unproductive.

Guidelines for this selection suggest that the supervisor should:

(i) Select areas for which data is available so that items can be dealt with concretely, not through inference.

(ii) Select bits of behaviour that are exemplary of larger conceptual categories: focus on smaller items, then show the relationship to the whole.

(iii) Use comparison and contrast to make data more meaningful for the teacher.

(iv) Be cautious of dealing with too many emotion-laden issues in one conference, and instead, steer a course for balance.

(v) Consider the element of time.

(vi) Consider the element of energy. Both supervisor and teacher must pace themselves and not try to deal with too much at once.

(vii) Present data in a logical order.

Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

12. To what extent does the feedback focus on modifiable behaviours rather than on what the teacher cannot do anything about?

By focussing on what the student teacher can modify, the supervisor offers the teacher the opportunity to change and feel successful. This will create a positive atmosphere about feedback.

Example: Speak about "possible ways of rearranging the students' desks" rather than "the loud clicking of the clock disturbed some students."

Second Example: When an unsatisfactory behaviour or problem has been suggested by the supervisor and the student is asked for opinions or suggestions to remediate the behaviour or problem (related to question 11 above).

Other Examples: ______________________________

____

____

____

13. To what extent do the feedback sessions emphasize items requested by the student teachers rather than those imposed by the supervisors?

When the student teacher has concerns or goals related to teaching, the student teacher should be encouraged through a trustworthy, helping relationship, to request the feedback from the supervisor on certain aspects. The student teacher's request for feedback is a sign of interest and care. This information and any subsequent change in action can serve as a springboard into other meaningful aspects. For example, a supervisor who is requested for feedback is also receiving feedback from the sender of the person's effectiveness as a supervisor.

Examples: ________________________________

____

____

____

14. To what extent is an attempt made at the end of the conference to check on the feedback given by asking the student teacher to summarize the main points or ideas raised between the teacner and supervisor during the session?

This eliminates or minimizes any discrepancies on the perceptions of both the supervisor and the student teacher of what the conference was all about and provides a clearer focus for the next lesson. "Feedback" on the feedback sessions is just as important.

Examples: ________________________________

____

____

____

15. To what extent does the place of meeting provide privacy during the conference sessions rather than interruptions and distractions?

Very definitely, conferences should occur in a situation where privacy is ensured as much as possible. The staff room is the least desirable setting. The presence of a third party who "drops by" can be most unsettling. Much of the value of the conferences depends on the quality of the relationship between supervisor and student teacher, so interruptions and distractions from others must be minimized. An exception to this point, of course, is a planned three-way conference among cooperating teacher, faculty consultant, and student teacher.

Examples: ____________________

____

____

____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Pam E. Wanga

7-130D Education Bldg. N.
The University of Alberta
Office: 432-4909
Residence: 436-0236

TIME SCHEDULE FOR RESEARCHER'S VISITS TO THE SCHOOLS

School	Day/s of Visit
Kensington	Tuesdays/Fridays
Meadowlark	Thursdays/ Mondays
Malmo	Wednesdays
Afton	Mondays
St. Boniface	Wednesdays

Activities During Visits

1. Collect two Feedback Analysis Forms from each student teacher every week.
2. Sit in at least two feedback sessions with each student teacher during the four weeks of student teaching and code the session on the Observation Conference Checklist.
3. Administer the Satisfaction Questionnaire on the last week of student teaching.
4. Conduct follow up interviews if required.
5. Arrange to collect the completed questionnaires and how to follow up the student teachers needing more time after the student teaching for completion of their questionnaires.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Pam E. Wanga

APPENDIX H: RESULTS OF t-TESTS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS SCORES OF FACULTY CONSULTANTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

1. Results of t-tests on the Effectiveness Scores of Faculty Consultants and Cooperating Teachers
2. Results of t-tests on Overall Effectiveness Scores, School by School

Results of t-tests on the Effectiveness Scores for Each Item, All Schools Combined

ITEM	SCHOOL	FACULTY CONSULTANTS			COOPERATING TEACHERS				
		N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	T	P
1. Supportive -- Non-supportive	1	7	1.71	0.49	7	1.43	0.54	1.04	0.317
	2	23	1.91	0.85	20	2.10	1.33	-0.54	0.594
	3	14	2.35	1.15	15	2.00	1.13	0.84	0.407
	4	14	2.00	0.78	19	1.21	0.42	3.42	0.003**
	5	9	1.22	0.44	21	1.81	1.03	-2.19	0.037*
2. Emphasized performance -- Emphasized personal qualities	1	7	1.43	0.54	7	1.43	0.54	0.0	1.000
	2	23	2.52	1.31	20	2.15	1.09	1.00	0.322
	3	14	2.21	0.89	14	1.93	1.14	0.74	0.467
	4	14	1.71	0.73	19	2.05	1.18	-0.95	0.350
	5	9	1.78	0.67	21	2.33	0.91	-1.64	0.112
3. Based on observations -- Based on inferences	1	7	2.00	0.0	7	1.86	0.9	0.42	0.682
	2	23	1.87	0.92	20	2.25	1.33	-1.10	0.277
	3	14	2.21	1.22	15	1.93	1.49	0.57	0.573
	4	14	1.57	0.51	19	1.63	0.60	-0.30	0.764
	5	9	1.56	0.73	21	1.95	0.87	-1.20	0.239
4. Descriptive -- Evaluative	1	7	2.43	1.40	7	2.14	1.22	0.41	0.690
	2	23	2.43	0.99	20	2.80	1.47	-0.96	0.340
	3	14	2.28	0.91	15	2.33	1.35	-0.11	0.913
	4	14	2.36	0.84	19	1.84	0.69	1.93	0.062
	5	9	1.78	0.83	21	2.57	1.54	-1.45	0.158
5. Specific and concrete -- General and Abstract	1	7	1.86	1.07	7	2.57	1.81	-0.90	0.387
	2	23	2.26	0.92	20	2.75	1.21	-1.51	0.139
	3	14	2.43	1.22	15	2.20	1.01	0.55	0.587
	4	14	1.79	0.80	19	1.79	0.86	-0.01	0.990
	5	9	1.56	0.73	19	1.37	1.12	-1.98	0.058
6. Well timed -- Poorly timed	1	7	1.86	0.69	7	1.71	1.11	0.29	0.778
	2	22	2.27	1.12	20	2.80	1.20	-1.47	0.148
	3	14	2.29	0.73	15	2.07	0.88	0.73	0.474
	4	14	2.14	1.10	19	1.68	0.75	1.43	0.164
	5	9	2.56	1.81	21	2.52	1.29	0.05	0.957
7. Giver shared information -- Giver gave advice	1	7	2.14	0.69	7	1.71	0.76	1.11	0.290
	2	23	2.91	1.28	20	2.70	1.49	0.51	0.616
	3	14	2.50	1.23	14	2.21	1.37	0.58	0.566
	4	14	2.71	1.07	19	1.53	0.77	3.71	0.001**
	5	9	2.89	1.36	21	2.90	1.58	-0.03	0.979
8. Emphasized alternatives -- Emphasized "the" path	1	7	2.43	0.79	7	2.00	0.82	1.00	0.337
	2	23	2.17	1.03	20	2.30	1.72	-0.29	0.777
	3	14	2.36	0.93	15	1.93	0.88	1.26	0.219
	4	14	2.64	0.63	19	1.95	0.62	3.15	0.004**
	5	9	1.89	0.78	20	2.70	1.72	-1.75	0.092
9. Framed in "more or less" terms -- Framed in "either or" terms	1	7	1.71	0.49	7	1.57	0.79	0.41	0.690
	2	23	2.43	0.73	20	2.50	1.32	-0.20	0.845
	3	14	2.57	1.40	15	2.07	0.96	1.14	0.264
	4	14	2.57	0.76	18	2.00	0.59	2.40	0.023*
	5	8	2.00	0.54	21	2.52	1.17	-1.65	0.111

Results of t-tests on the Effectiveness Scores for Each Item, All Schools Combined

ITEM	SCHOOL	FACULTY CONSULTANTS			COOPERATING TEACHERS				
		N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	T	P
10. Based on receiver's needs (includes negative criticism) -- Based on giver's needs and what he/she wants to get off his/her chest	1	7	1.71	0.76	7	1.71	0.76	0.0	1.000
	2	23	2.26	0.86	20	2.35	1.50	-0.23	0.816
	3	14	2.36	0.84	15	2.27	1.49	0.20	0.841
	4	14	2.07	0.83	19	1.63	0.68	1.67	0.105
	5	8	1.50	0.76	21	2.62	1.12	-2.60	0.015*
11. Useful and Manageable amount given -- Overload given	1	7	1.86	0.38	7	1.71	0.76	0.45	0.663
	2	23	1.96	0.88	20	2.35	1.73	-0.92	0.365
	3	14	2.21	0.80	14	2.07	0.92	0.44	0.664
	4	14	2.00	0.56	19	1.53	0.61	2.29	0.029*
	5	8	1.75	1.39	21	1.62	0.67	0.26	0.805
12. Emphasized modifiable items -- Emphasized non-modifiable items	1	7	1.57	0.54	7	2.00	1.29	-0.81	0.433
	2	23	1.96	0.88	20	1.95	1.05	0.02	0.982
	3	14	2.14	0.86	15	2.20	0.94	-0.17	0.866
	4	14	2.07	0.62	19	1.89	0.66	0.78	0.439
	5	9	2.11	1.61	21	1.95	0.67	0.28	0.783
13. Emphasized requested items -- Emphasized imposed items	1	7	2.14	0.38	7	1.57	0.79	1.73	0.109
	2	22	2.64	1.00	20	2.55	1.32	0.24	0.811
	3	14	2.50	0.76	15	2.07	0.96	1.34	0.191
	4	14	2.43	0.85	19	2.00	1.16	1.17	0.250
	5	9	2.22	1.20	21	2.81	1.08	-1.32	0.197
14. Checked; receiver encouraged to summarize -- Unchecked; receiver not encouraged to summarize	1	7	3.86	1.78	7	3.29	2.29	0.52	0.611
	2	23	3.43	1.44	20	3.10	1.48	0.75	0.458
	3	14	2.71	1.14	15	2.87	1.25	-0.34	0.734
	4	14	2.79	0.70	19	2.47	0.91	1.07	0.291
	5	9	3.11	1.54	21	3.14	1.46	-0.05	0.957
15. Privacy ensured - interruptions and distractions minimized -- No privacy - interruptions and distractions evident	1	7	2.29	0.49	7	1.57	0.79	2.04	0.064
	2	23	2.74	1.32	20	2.40	0.82	1.02	0.312
	3	14	2.43	1.16	15	2.60	1.92	-0.29	0.775
	4	14	2.21	0.70	19	2.74	0.81	1.78	0.085
	5	9	2.44	1.88	21	2.33	0.97	0.22	0.831

Results of t-Tests on Overall Effectiveness
Scores School by School

School	Faculty Consultants			Cooperating Teachers				
	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	T	P
1	7	2.07	0.42	7	1.89	0.91	0.48	0.643
2	23	2.38	0.75	20	2.47	1.08	-0.31	0.757
3	14	2.37	0.74	15	2.20	0.93	0.55	0.589
4	14	2.20	0.41	19	1.80	0.50	2.49	0.018*
5	9	2.03	0.55	21	2.41	0.78	-1.30	0.205

APPENDIX I: SEQUENCE OF OCCURRENCE OF THE TOPICS AS INITIAL AND AS SECOND TOPICS

1. Pictorial Representation of the Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics in the Faculty Consultants' Feedback Sessions
2. Pictorial Representation of the Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics in the Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions

Pictorial Representation of the Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics in the Faculty Consultants' Feedback Sessions

Second Topics (Weak Link)	First Topics	Second Topics (Strong Link)
Instructional Planning Content of Lesson Interpersonal Relationship Classroom Management	. . . . . Personal Qualities - - - - -	Presentation of Lesson
Content of Lesson Review of Performance Classroom Management	. . . . . . Instructional Planning ———	Other Topics
Instructional Planning Classroom Management Review of Performance Informal Conversation	. . . . Content of Lesson - - - - -	Presentation of Lesson
Instructional Planning Content of Lesson Interpersonal Relationship Discipline Review of Performance Other Topics	. . . . . Presentation of Lesson - - - - -	Classroom Management
Presentation of Lesson	. . . . . Quality of Interpersonal Relationship - - - - -	Classroom Management Personal Qualities
Instructional Planning Content of Lesson Interpersonal Relationship Other Topics Discipline Review of Performance	. . . . . Classroom Management - - - -	Presentation of Lesson
Personal Qualities Presentation of Lesson Informal Conversation Other Topics Interpersonal Relationship	. . . . Discipline - - - - - - - -	Classroom Management
Personal Qualities Content of Lesson Presentation of Lesson Interpersonal Relationship Discipline Informal Conversation Instructional Planning Other Topics	. . . . . Review of Performance - - - - -	Classroom Management
	Informal Conversation - - - - -	Presentation of Lesson Review of Performance
Presentation of Lesson Review of Performance	- - - - - - - - - Other Topics - - - - - - - - -	Instructional Planning Classroom Management

Legend

. . . . . Some Link (1% to 25%)

- - - - - Strong Link (26% to 50%)

——— Very Strong Link (51% to 75%)

Pictorial Representation of the Sequence of Occurrence of the Topics in the Cooperating Teachers' Feedback Sessions

Second Topics (Weak Link)		First Topics		Second Topics (Strong Link)
Instructional Planning Presentation of Lesson	. . . .	Personal Qualities	- - - - - -	Classroom Management
Other Topics Classroom Management	. . . . . .	Instructional Planning	- - - -	Content of Lesson Presentation of Lesson
Classroom Management Content of Lesson Review of Performance Other Topics	. . . .	Content of Lesson	- - - - -	Instructional Planning Presentation of Lesson
Review of Performance Content of Lesson Instructional Planning Other Topics Personal Qualities Interpersonal Relationship Discipline	. . . . . .	Presentation of Lesson	- - - - -	Classroom Management
		Quality of Interpersonal Relationship	* * * *	Presentation of Lesson
Instructional Planning Discipline Personal Qualities Content of Lesson Review of Performance	. . . .	Classroom Management	- - - -	Presentation of Lesson
		Discipline	- - - - - - -	Classroom Management Review of Performance
Presentation of Lesson Other Topics Content of Lesson Instructional Planning	. . . . . .	Review of Performance	————	Classroom Management
		Informal Conversation		

Other Topics

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Instructional Planning
Content of Lesson
Presentation of Lesson
Discipline

Classroom Management

Legend

. . . . . Some Link (1% to 25%)
- - - - - Strong Link (26% to 50%)
———— Very Strong Link (51% to 75%)
* * * * * Significantly Strong Link (76% to 100%)

APPENDIX J: RESULTS OF F-TESTS
SATISFACTION SCORES

1. Results of F-tests on Supportiveness Scores
2. Results of F-tests on Adequacy of Feedback Scores
3. Results of F-tests on Quality of Interaction Scores

Results of F-Tests on Supportiveness Scores
N = 22

School	Faculty Consultants			Cooperating Teachers		
	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	$\overline{X}$	SD
1	2	3.93	0.30	2	3.71	1.01
2	5	4.03	0.42	5	3.46	0.99
3	4	3.82	0.73	4	3.53	0.65
4	5	3.91	0.55	5	4.09	0.48
5	6	3.57	0.79	6	3.76	0.95
F Ratio		0.41			0.42	
F Prob.		0.799			0.789	

Results of F-Tests on Adequacy
of Feedback Scores
N = 22

School	Faculty Consultants			Cooperating Teachers		
	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
1	2	3.67	0.0	2	3.67	1.18
2	5	3.74	0.39	5	3.04	0.73
3	4	3.54	0.41	4	3.33	1.04
4	5	3.27	0.53	5	3.67	0.41
5	6	3.00	0.62	6	3.64	0.51
F Ratio		1.86			0.69	
F Prob.		0.164			0.605	

Results of F-Tests on Quality of Interaction Scores

School	Faculty Consultants			Cooperating Teachers		
	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	$\overline{X}$	SD
1	2	3.17	0.71	2	2.67	1.41
2	5	4.13	0.38	5	3.27	0.76
3	4	4.00	0.86	4	3.33	0.31
4	5	4.13	0.56	5	4.27	0.68
5	6	3.50	1.26	6	4.06	0.77
F Ratio		0.87			1.77	
F Prob.		0.501			0.181	

APPENDIX K: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE OPEN ENDED ITEMS

The respondents were requested to indicate any other ways, not listed under any of the earlier items of the Satisfaction Questionnaire, in which supervisory feedback was helpful to the student teacher.

Responses suggested that supervisory supportiveness was most helpful in building the confidence of the student teachers. Such supportiveness was evident in supervisors who offered a lot of encouragement to the student teachers regardless of the mistakes that had been observed during actual teaching. Such supervisors also demonstrated teaching skills that the student teachers might not have been aware of and shared an overall positive attitude towards the student teachers' ability to teach and handle the children. The student teachers reported that supportive supervisors were also observed by the student teachers to be accommodating of any questions or concerns that the student teachers had raised during the feedback sessions as well as being able to offer helpful suggestions regarding such questions and concerns. Finally, supportive supervisors were those whose feedback sessions were less threatening and who tended to work together with the student teacher for the betterment of the immediate and future performances of the student teacher; encourage self-evaluation on the part of the student teacher; relate teaching performance to basic philosophies of teaching; and discuss the student teacher's progress by comparing progress over more than one round of student teaching.

The nature of support that the student teachers received from both the faculty consultant and the cooperating teachers were exemplified by the following statements made by the student teachers which fall into five groups as follows:

1. Building Self-Confidence

- Overall, the sessions with both my faculty consultant and my cooperating teacher have helped me build up a great deal of self-confidence. They have also made me more aware of the importance of self-evaluation.

- The faculty consultant was supportive and positive about my ability in teaching.

2. Understanding Philosophical Issues about Teaching

- I considered the feedback sessions an opportunity to clarify my aims or philosophy for my lessons. I also considered the sessions an opportunity to ask questions about my own and the supervisor's approaches to teaching.

3. Gaining/Learning from Experienced Supervisor

- The team (joint) planning of some lessons with my cooperating teacher together with her suggestions and the positive classroom environment were deeply appreciated.

4. Gaining/Learning from a Threat-free Atmosphere

- The casual, informal atmosphere (surrounding the setting for the feedback sessions) was a definite plus! With our faculty consultant especially, it felt very comfortable.

5. Evaluating Progress on an On-going Basis (Formative Evaluation)

- The faculty consultant was able to compare my progress between 1st and 2nd rounds of student teaching. I appreciated this very much.

Preferred Feedback

The responses to this item were meant to be suggestive of any other ways the feedback sessions might have been helpful to the student teachers but were not. Generally, the student teachers would have preferred the following: the sessions to be better timed (not to come too soon or too late after classroom observation); the faculty consultants to make more regular visits and base their feedback on actual classroom observations; more feedback in the first few weeks of student teaching; better approach to matching supervisor and student teacher personalities and more specific, concrete and constructive feedback. The following examples of responses emerged as areas of concern for the student teachers:

1. Timing of the Feedback Session

- At times, when suggestions came too quickly (too soon?) and frequently, the suggestions became more like criticisms and made me feel less confident in my abilities.

- I believe the onus should be on the cooperating teacher to say, "My student teacher needs a feedback session so I can help him." I should not therefore, have had to guess if I was doing something wrong and needed help as a result. He could have helped me with various ways of approaching each subject area.

2. Lack of Adequate Feedback

- I would have liked to receive feedback a bit more often than I did.

- I feel that much more encouragement and discussion should have occurred in the first two weeks from both the faculty consultant and the cooperating teacher.

- Far more feedback was needed from my cooperating teacher. One faculty consultant came to our school one day. He observed classroom teaching of four of us in the morning and four of us in the early afternoon. He held a feedback session with the entire group -- eight of us -- over the lunch break. The interesting thing was that the four of us he had observed in the morning received lots of feedback whereas the four of us he observed in the early afternoon had to settle for less -- reading comments from a sheet of paper with no chance for discussion. Furthermore, even among the group that received lots of feedback, there was a lack of specificity in the feedback they received in that not every individual could identify with and therefore comment on the feedback. What do you think about group feedback Pam (researcher)?

3. Inadequate Visitations/Observations

- The faculty consultant could have made weekly visits from week 1 through week 5 of student teaching so that he could tell me where I was improving or not improving in a more specific area, for example, management of discipline problems.

- The faculty consultant could have seen a wider range of subjects if he had come more often or on different days of the week. He always came on the same day/days of the week and observed me teach the same subjects. I feel that some subjects were easier to teach than others. The faculty consultants' observations were in the subjects that were more difficult to teach.

- The feedback from the faculty consultant was just not regular or frequent enough. He just wasn't around enough, therefore, I found his feedback of little value compared to my cooperating teacher's feedback!

4. Personality Clashes

- This is what I can say about the feedback I received from my cooperating teacher -- I cannot see that feedback in a situation that is so contrived and so unrealistic can possibly be of value. I have felt that someone has been attempting to mold me rather than help me to function, from my basic aims of education, in the classroom. These teachers (the cooperating teachers) are far too convinced that their way is the only way, that they are good teachers, teaching the right things in the right way. As a result, they (the cooperating teachers) have developed an attitude that it is their duty to screen us such that only those of us as good as they are get into the school system. From that point of view, no feedback can be of value to me. I am not there in the schools for a screening process but rather for a learning experience. The reality of this concept of student teaching has been missed to the misery of us all!

5. Lack of Constructive/Specific/Concrete Feedback (presence of indiscriminate praise)

- My faculty consultant should have spent more time in the classroom and therefore given more feedback and more constructive criticism, not just "you're doing pretty well."

- I really needed to hear some negative but constructive criticism from my cooperating teacher in order to improve my teaching skills. I knew that I would have performed better in some areas although my cooperating teacher usually didn't point out these areas. I wonder why, Pam?

- The faculty consultant and cooperating teacher could have suggested more alternative ways to overcome discipline and other problems in the classroom.

- I would have liked more evaluative feedback from my faculty consultant. I felt that he observed me but didn't really evaluate me.

- The faculty consultant should have made more observations of my classroom teaching and emphasized my actual teaching performance rather than small picky details.

- The cooperating teacher should have given more feedback regarding specific lessons taught rather than my general teaching behavior.

6. Lack of Consensus and Precision on Various Formats or Instruments for Observation and Evaluation of Student Teaching (includes degree of involvement of student teachers in self-evaluation)

- The sessions should have been based on recommended guidelines so as to eliminate personal ideas or conversation which interfered with relevant discussions on a teaching method or problem. Such guidelines would show, for example, what the limits of the student teachers were regarding our roles during student teaching, e.g., "Can we (student teachers) make alternate suggestions to a planning of a lesson by the cooperating teacher. . . . When does the cooperating teacher step in to regain control in the monitoring of a lesson's content? Such guidelines would alleviate some assumptions on personal relationships and teaching performance.

- The final evaluation sheet should have been used more often as a guideline for feedback sessions.

- More emphasis on approaches to classroom and discipline would have been more helpful to me during the feedback sessions.

- My teacher was not familiar with her role as a cooperating teacher. She asked me for a sample evaluation form to see what areas I should be marked in! She didn't seem to know how she should evaluate me.

- I feel there must be some contradictions in the evaluation forms used by cooperating teachers to evaluate us. What my teacher may see as 'super' or 'good' she may mark off 'average' on the form whereas another teacher may mark off 'above average' or 'excellent.' I would like to see a new evaluation form being used -- a form with comments instead of check marks. Comments are much more valuable. This would get rid of the classification of 'average,' 'above average' or, 'excellent.' I don't like to be slotted into a category.

Overall Impressions of Student Teachers

The additional comments that were generated under this item were as varied as the student teachers themselves were in their experiences related to feedback sessions in particular, and the student teaching as a whole. The only thing that was common to all the comments was that they implied "overall" impressions of the respondents with whatever areas of concern they were expressing. The following were the actual responses, categories and their examples:

1. General Impression with Feedback Sessions

- I found the feedback sessions very informal and in no way threatening. I also found the feedback sessions very beneficial because I was treated as a colleague rather than a student. Nagative comments, therefore, were taken by me, as a way of helping me improve rather than having the feeling of being told what I should be doing. Overall, being treated as a colleague was the most important item for building my self-confidence.

- Overall, I was pleased with my feedback sessions. The main weaknesses I found were the emphasis at times by my faculty consultant on small details that I felt were less important than the actual teaching; and the lack of feedback on specific lessons by my cooperating teacher.

- The timing of sessions at times was a problem -- other children in the classroom, teachers, student teachers etc.

at times made a difference to classroom feedback sessions.

- I would have loved more privacy during feedback sessions. In the staffroom, everybody got to hear my faults and that upset me very much.

2. General Impression with the Research

- In sincerely hope that faculty consultants and cooperating teachers can learn something useful from this research, Pam (researcher).

- Pam (the researcher), after working through your questionnaire, I have found it to be valuable. Contrary to what I had told you earlier (that it sounded like a waste of my precious but limited time), the questionnaire has helped me to sort out some of my frustrations due to my student teaching experiences. Thank you Pam.

  Pam (the researcher) this last form (the Satisfaction Questionnaire) was highly appreciated since it covered a few other things that I had not thought about. Because this form (the questionnaire) brought up these points, I noticed where improvements could have been made especially on my part. Thank you, Pam.

- This (the Satisfaction Questionnaire) was difficult for me to fill out as I've only had one feedback session with my faculty supervisor in the 5 weeks of student teaching. This might alter (affect?) the responses I gave on this questionnaire.

3. General Concerns with Evaluation Procedures

- I strongly felt that observation of a student teacher's classroom teaching once a week by the faculty consultant does not provide a valid assessment of the student teacher's ability, especially when serious final evaluation for certification and employment purposes is to be done as was the case. Although I did not receive feedback regularly from my supervisors, I learned to assess myself and develop my skills without outside direction (but who can take my self-assessment seriously, especially if it is good?).

APPENDIX L: DETERMINATION OF OVERALL SUPERVISORY SCORES BY SCHOOL

School 1

School 2

School 3

School 4

School 5

Total Effectiveness, Satisfaction and Overall Supervisory Scores for Individual Schools

Total Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores for Individual Supervisors

A Comparison of Overall Supervisory Scores Between Schools

Individual Supervisors' Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores: School 1

Supervisor	Supervisor Effectiveness Score* (6 - 1)	Average Student Satisfaction Score (5 - 1)				Overall Supervisory Score
		FAC1	FAC2	FAC3	Total	
CT 1	4.18	3.00	2.83	1.67	2.50	2.92
CT 2	5.82	4.43	4.50	3.67	4.20	4.60
FC 1	4.89	3.93	3.67	3.17	3.59	3.91
TOTAL	4.96	3.79	3.67	2.83	3.43	3.81

*Reversed Scores

CT = Cooperating Teacher

FC = Faculty Consultant

Individual Supervisors' Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores: School 2

Supervisor	Supervisor Effectiveness Score* (6 - 1)	Average Student Satisfaction Score (5 - 1)				Overall Supervisory Score
		FAC1	FAC2	FAC3	Total	
CT 1	3.07	3.00	2.17	2.33	2.50	2.64
CT 2	3.93	2.14	2.83	3.00	2.66	2.98
CT 3	5.58	4.57	3.20	3.67	3.81	4.26
CT 4	4.48	3.29	2.83	3.00	3.04	3.40
CT 5	5.58	4.29	4.17	4.33	4.26	4.59
FC 1	4.60	4.03	3.74	4.13	3.97	4.13
TOTAL	4.54	3.55	3.16	3.41	3.37	3.67

*Reversed Scores

CT = Cooperating Teacher

FC = Faculty Consultant

Individual Supervisors' Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores: School 3

Supervisor	Supervisor Effectiveness Score* (6 - 1)	Average Student Satisfaction Score (5 - 1)				Overall Supervisory Score
		FAC1	FAC2	FAC3	Total	
CT 1	3.91	3.43	3.17	3.00	3.20	3.38
CT 2	5.60	4.43	4.50	4.67	4.53	4.80
CT 3	5.12	3.43	3.67	4.00	3.70	4.05
CT 4	4.35	2.86	2.00	1.67	2.17	2.72
FC 2	4.63	3.82	3.54	4.00	3.79	4.00
TOTAL	4.72	3.59	3.38	3.47	3.48	3.79

*Reversed Scores

CT = Cooperating Teacher

FC = Faculty Consultant

Individual Supervisors' Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores: School 4

Supervisor	Supervisor Effectiveness Score* (6 - 1)	Average Student Satisfaction Score (5 - 1)				Overall Supervisory Score
		FAC1	FAC2	FAC3	Total	
CT 1	5.27	4.29	4.17	5.00	4.48	4.68
CT 2	5.05	4.43	3.83	4.00	4.09	4.33
CT 3	5.68	3.57	3.17	3.67	3.47	4.02
CT 4	4.87	3.57	3.33	3.67	3.52	3.86
CT 5	5.13	4.57	3.83	5.00	4.47	4.63
FC 3	4.79	3.91	3.27	4.13	3.77	4.03
TOTAL	5.13	4.06	3.60	4.24	3.97	4.26

*Reversed Scores

CT = Cooperating Teacher

FC = Faculty Consultant

Individual Supervisors' Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores: School 5

Supervisor	Supervisor Effectiveness Score* (6 - 1)	Average Student Satisfaction Score (5 - 1)				Overall Supervisory Score
		FAC1	FAC2	FAC3	Total	
CT 1	5.05	4.29	4.17	4.33	4.26	4.46
CT 2	5.37	4.43	4.00	5.00	4.48	4.70
CT 3	4.38	3.71	3.83	4.00	3.85	3.98
CT 4	4.75	4.57	3.83	4.33	4.25	4.37
CT 5	3.18	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.56	2.71
CT 6	4.81	3.57	3.00	4.00	3.52	3.85
FC 4	4.92	3.57	3.00	3.50	3.36	3.75
TOTAL	4.64	3.73	3.55	3.98	3.75	3.97

*Reversed Scores

CT = Cooperating Teacher

FC = Faculty Consultant

Total Effectiveness, Satisfaction and Overall Supervisory Scores* For Individual Schools

Total Supervisory Scores	Individual Schools				
	1	2	3	4	5
Effectiveness**	4.96	4.54	4.72	5.13	4.64
Satisfaction	3.43	3.37	3.48	3.97	3.75
Overall	3.81	3.67	3.79	4.26	3.97

*The higher the score the better

**Reversed scores

Total Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scores for Individual Supervisors

Supervisor	Supervisory Effectiveness Score (SES)* (1 - 6)	Average Student Satisfaction Score (5 - 1)			
		FAC1	FAC2	FAC3	Total**
CT 1	1.95	4.29	4.17	4.33	4.46
CT 2	1.63	4.43	4.00	5.00	4.70
CT 3	2.82	3.00	2.83	1.67	2.92
CT 4	1.18	4.43	4.50	3.67	4.60
CT 5	3.09	3.43	3.17	3.00	3.38
CT 6	1.40	4.43	4.50	4.67	4.80
CT 7	3.93	3.00	2.17	2.33	2.64
CT 8	3.07	2.14	2.83	3.00	2.98
CT 9	1.42	4.57	3.20	3.67	4.26
CT10	2.52	3.29	2.83	3.00	3.40
CT11	1.42	4.29	4.17	4.33	4.59
CT12	1.88	3.43	3.67	4.00	4.05
CT13	2.62	3.71	3.83	4.00	3.98
CT14	1.73	4.29	4.17	5.00	4.68
CT15	1.95	4.43	3.83	4.00	4.33
CT16	1.32	3.57	3.17	3.67	4.02
CT17	2.65	2.86	2.00	1.67	2.72
CT18	2.25	4.57	3.83	4.33	4.37
CT19	2.13	3.57	3.33	3.67	3.86
CT20	3.82	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.71
CT21	1.87	4.57	3.83	5.00	4.63
CT22	2.19	3.57	3.00	4.00	3.85
FC 1	2.32	4.00	3.72	3.86	4.06
FC 2	2.37	3.82	3.54	4.00	4.00
FC 3	2.21	3.91	3.27	4.13	4.03
FC 4	2.08	3.57	3.00	3.50	3.75

[*] The Supervisory Effectiveness Scores were reversed in computing the aggregate (total) score for each supervisor.

[**] The total scores are computed by adding the three Factor Scores and the Supervisory Effectiveness Scores and Dividing by 4.

Comparison of Overall* Supervisory
Scores** Between Schools

School	Range of Overall Supervisory Scores							
	1.00-1.50	1.50-2.00	2.00-2.50	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	4.50-5.00
1				✓			x	✓
2				✓ ✓	✓		x ✓	✓
3				✓	✓		x ✓	✓
4						x ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓
5				✓		x ✓ ✓	✓	✓

* The SES were reversed in computing overall scores

** The higher the score, the better

x Faculty Consultant (N = 4)

✓ Cooperating Teacher (N = 22)